

ARCHBISHOP COMMENTED – I

No. CCCXC (390)

January 3, 2015

Unhooked from the object, minds go very bad.
Church and Society have both gone mad.

For today's Church authorities "there is no fixed truth, there is no dogma. Everything is evolving." So said Archbishop Lefebvre (1905–1991) in 1991 (see last week's "Eleison Comments"). For at the end of his life the Archbishop saw more clearly than ever what he had been up against in his heroic defence of the Faith. Since then the liberals (unknown to themselves as such?) who took over his Society of St Pius X as soon as he was gone, have still not understood the gravity of the problem as identified by the Archbishop. Therefore let these "Comments" open the New Year by attempting once more to lay open the mortal wound of today's Church and world.

When Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) erected man's refusal of God's reality into a philosophical system, based on his utterly false proclamation that the human mind cannot know the object as it is in itself, then the philosophy department of universities all over the world began to spill craziness into the streets, because people wanted to make freedom their god and Kant offered them the supreme liberation, that of the mind from its object.

Now Catholics not yet contaminated by the Kantian fantasy know that God and his Heaven exist quite outside of, and independently of, their little minds, and so if they want to be happy for eternity their minds had better deal in objective reality and not in subjective fantasy. Therefore for a century and a half a God-given series of anti-liberal Popes stood up to the liberal world going constantly more crazy all around, and these protected the Church from the prestigious and popular subjectivism. But by the 1950's the Church's cardinals and bishops were not praying enough to maintain this protection of their minds and hearts from the madness, known within the Church as "modernism," and so in the conclave of 1958 they elected one of their own, the supposedly "good" John XXIII, a liberal (unknown to himself as such? God knows), who duly launched in 1962 the disastrous Second Vatican Council.

Why disastrous? Because the madness of subjectivism (the refusal of objective reality), instead of being still utterly condemned by the Church's highest authorities, was now

adopted by them and made (consciously or unconsciously? – God knows) into the official basis of Church doctrine and action. The problem could not be graver. The officials of God's true Church, appointed to proclaim and defend God's objective truths of salvation, were henceforth filtering these through their subjectivist minds. Imagine having nothing other than filthy bottles in which to store the best of wine. It can only be ruined. Today's Conciliar Church officials can only ruin God's truth.

Here is why the Archbishop said in 1991, "We are dealing with people (at the top of the Church) who have a different philosophy from ours, a different way of seeing, who are influenced by all modern subjectivist philosophers. For them, there is no fixed truth, no fixed dogma. Everything is evolving. This is really the Masonic destruction of the Faith. Fortunately we (Traditionalists) have Tradition to lean on."

But what has happened to Tradition without the Archbishop to guide it? Alas, the authorities at the top of his Society of St Pius X, which for some 40 years spearheaded the defence of the objective Faith, cannot have been praying seriously enough to protect their minds and hearts from being in turn infected by subjectivism. They too have lost the primacy of objective truth, and so they are being played by the Romans like a fish is played by a fisherman. Archbishop Lefebvre, pray for us!

Kyrie eleison.

ARCHBISHOP COMMENTED – II

No. CCCXCI (391)

January 10, 2015

The Archbishop wished Rome not himself to approve, Rather that Rome for the Church's good would move.

Before leaving Archbishop Lefebvre's realistic remarks of 1991 (cf. the last two EC's), let us comment further, in the hope of helping Catholics to keep their balance between scorning authority in the name of truth and belittling truth for the sake of authority. For ever since the churchmen of Vatican II (1962–1965) put their full authority behind the Church Revolution (religious liberty, collegial equality and ecumenical fraternity), Catholics have been thrown off balance: when Authority tramples upon Truth, how indeed is one to maintain one's respect for both?

Now in the tormented aftermath of Vatican II, who can be said to have borne fruits comparable to that preservation of Catholic doctrine, Mass and sacraments for which the Archbishop was mainly (albeit not solely) responsible? In which case, the balance that he himself struck between Truth and Authority must be especially deserving of consideration.

Firstly, let us consider a simple observation of the Archbishop on authority: "Now we have the tyranny of authority because there are no more rules from the past." Amongst human beings all with original sin, truth needs authority to back it, because it is a Jeffersonian illusion that truth thrown into the market-place will prevail all on its own without a disaster being necessary to teach reality. Authority is to truth as means to end, not end to means. It is Catholic faith which saves, and that Faith lies in a series of truths, not in authority. Those truths are so much the substance and purpose of Catholic Authority that when it is cut loose from them, as by Vatican II, then it is cut adrift until the first tyrant to lay hands on it bends it to his will. The tyranny of Paul VI followed naturally on the Council, just as by pursuing approval from the champions of the same Council, the leadership of the Society of St Pius X has likewise behaved itself tyrannically in recent years. Contrast how the Archbishop built up his authority over Tradition by serving the truth.

A second remark of his from 1991 deserving of further comment is where he said that

when in 1988 he tried to reach an agreement with Rome by means of his Protocol of May 5, “I think I can say that I went even further than I should have.” Indeed that Protocol lays itself open to criticism on important points, so here is the Archbishop himself admitting that he momentarily lost his balance, tilting briefly in favour of Rome’s authority and against Tradition’s truth. But he tilted only briefly, because as is well-known, on the very next morning he repudiated the Protocol, and he never again wavered until his death, so that from then on nobody could say either that he had not done all he could to reach agreement with Authority, or that it is an easy thing to get the balance always right between Truth and Authority.

A third remark throws light on his motivation in seeking from 1975 to 1988 some agreement with Roman Authority. Judging his motives by their own, his successors at the head of the SSPX talk as though he was always seeking its canonical regularisation. But he explained the Protocol as follows: “I hoped until the last minute that in Rome we would witness a little bit of loyalty.” In other words he was always pursuing the good of the Faith, and he never honoured Authority for anything other than for the sake of the Truth. Can as much be said for his successors?

Kyrie eleison.

HEBDOMANIA

No. CCCXCIII (393)

January 24, 2015

Today things never are what they appear.
To godless people skilful liars are dear.

The *Charlie Hebdo* attack of January 7 in which two muslim gunmen killed a dozen cartoonists and journalists in the Paris office of a satirical French weekly, and the enormous public protest of Jan. 11 against the attack in which leaders of several European nations were photo-opped as taking part, are best understood as one more episode in the war being waged by the enemies of God upon what little remains of Christian civilisation. Let us consider in order the cartoonists, the gunmen, the puppet politicians and peoples pandering to Islam and the puppet-masters behind them all.

The cartoonists lampooned not only Islam and muslims but also, from the world's one true religion, the Holy Trinity, our divine Saviour and the Blessed Virgin Mary. Now the one true God is extremely patient, but he is not mocked (Gal. VI, 7). As men have a right not to suffer from terrorism, so the true God has a right not to endure the public repetition of obscene and blasphemous cartoons. Then nobody justifies terrorism as such, but given that the French Church and State authorities refuse to censor obscene blasphemy, is it surprising if God allowed muslims to avenge his honour?

The gunmen, two young muslims, must have been acting religiously, because politically it was entirely foreseeable that their action would rouse opinion against Islam. Still, how could they dare to attack? Because across Europe muslims are by their birthrate and immigration getting stronger in numbers all the time, and they make no secret of the fact that, as soon as they are strong enough, by a bloodbath if necessary, they will islamize the once Christian nations of Europe.

So who persuaded these nations to adopt the suicidal policy of almost unrestricted immigration and unbelievable welfare benefits for the in fact unassimilable immigrants, and so on? Who but our bribed or bullied puppet politicians? In a moment of truth a year or so ago, the Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, admitted that "multi-culti," the mixing of contrary cultures, does not work. But a

week or so ago in connection with the *Hebdo* attack, did she not proclaim that “Islam belongs to Germany”? She had been brought to heel. She is a puppet because she is constantly acting against Germany’s true interests. For instance, were there not so many muslims in France, would *Charlie Hebdo* ever have bothered to ridicule Islam? And who votes for these puppet politicians? Puppet peoples, who allow their thinking to be enslaved by their vile media.

Then who are the puppet-masters? They are enemies of God, intent upon establishing their own godless New World Order, a police State designed to ensure that not one living soul escapes eternal Hell. Let us call them “Globalists.” Then was the *Hebdo* attack their work, one of their events like 9/11 in the USA and 7/7 in the UK, engineered to move public opinion, this time towards freedom for blasphemers and civil war? Most likely. The event was certainly not what it was made to seem. Famous example: the three-minute film clip showing a gunman shooting in the head point-blank a “muslim policeman” lying on the ground, with no blood, no recoil of the gun, and little movement of the “victim.” The clip may still be found, starting from here – <http://youtu.be/gobYWXgzWgY>.

And the Good Lord amidst all this madness? “Those whom he wishes to destroy, he first makes mad,” is the old saying. Pray 15 Mysteries a day for the triumph that he will engineer, through his Mother alone. Are the poor Globalists ever going to be taken by surprise!

Kyrie eleison.

CONTRADICTIONARY EPITAPH

No. CCCXCII (392)

January 17, 2015

Our nature, by God made good, Adam marred.
What good by God it wants, Adam makes hard.

*Under the wide and starry sky
Dig the grave and let me lie
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.*

*This be the verse you 'grave for me:
Here he lies where he longed to be.
Home is the sailor, home from sea
And the hunter home from the hill*

—R.L.Stevenson (1850–1894)

This epitaph for the poet himself is eloquent by its simplicity, and touching, because it touches on death, that inevitable tragedy of human life. Commemorating life and love, poets often treat of death, which so mysteriously cuts off both. Not wishing to think on the meaning of life or death, poor materialists cut off poetry and will print it as prose if they can, precisely to avoid having to think about anything higher than matter. But the mystery remains . . .

In theory, Stevenson's epitaph is brave. In the last three lines of each verse, in six lines out of eight, he says in six different ways that he is happy to die. But the poem is laden with contradiction. If "Glad did he live," how could he gladly die? If he was so glad to die, how could he have been glad to live? To be as glad to die as he claims, he must have lost his will to live, or shut it down, which he could only do by refusing to his life any destiny or meaning or existence beyond his animal death, and this he could only do by pretending to be no more than an animal. But what animals take the trouble to write poems eloquent and touching?

O Robert Louis, you knew you were not just an animal. You took the trouble to write many literary works, including a spellbinding tale of life and adventure for boys, *Treasure Island*, and a harrowing tale of corruption and death for adults, *Dr Jekyll and*

Mr Hyde, and your collected works make of you currently the 26th most translated author in the world. True, your parents were Scottish Presbyterians, a Calvinist sect dour enough in mid-19th century to turn many a good man into an atheist. But how could you sell yourself so short at death? How could you pretend that death is “home”?

The Creator did not originally design for animal death the rational animal that is man. Had all men from Adam and Eve made the right use of their rationality, or reason, for the appointed duration of their earthly lives, then instead of their now inevitable animal death they would have glided painlessly into the eternal life which the right use of their reason would have deserved for them. But that original design was frustrated when Adam disobeyed his Creator, and when by the mysterious solidarity of all future mankind with its first Father, he dragged down all men into original sin. From that moment on, contradiction is intrinsic to all human nature and life, because we have a created nature from God at war with our fallen nature from Adam. Our true – not false – “immortal longings” come from our nature as made by God and for God, while our animal death is “home” only to our nature as fallen. “Unhappy man that I am,” cries out St Paul (Rom.VII, 24–25), “who will deliver me from this body of death? The grace of God, by Jesus Christ Our Lord.”

Kyrie eleison.

HEBDOCURE

No. CCCXCIV (394)

January 31, 2015

More and more common will be the bloody attacks,
Until the world sees, Christ is who it lacks.

Last week these “Comments,” in a most politically incorrect manner, presented the heavily publicized January 7 attack in Paris on Charlie Hebdo as an attack upon the remains of Christian civilisation in France. Then let them this week put forward how Christian civilisation would solve the problem, in the same order, for cartoonists, gunmen, politicians, peoples and conspirators.

As for the cartoonists, if France were still Catholic, Church and State would still be united, as they were until the French Revolution, and State authorities would absolutely have forbidden such blasphemous anti-Christian cartoons as those by which Charlie Hebdo may well have provoked Almighty God to allow for the silencing of its cartoonists. But that would be censorship? Only a fool can think we suffer under no censorship today. The censorship is simply anti-Christian instead of Christian. Who today is free to blaspheme against Holocaustianity and its “gas-chambers”?

As for the muslim gunmen, to a Catholic France they might never have come. Never would Catholic State authorities have despised or hated muslims in their own countries, but at the same time never would they so have lost sight of the historic clash between Islam and Christianity as to allow to settle in France such a mass of muslim immigrants as have been allowed, even encouraged, to settle in France since World War II. Nor would they ever have learned to scorn their own race and despise their own traditions as they have allowed themselves to be taught to do today. By the Fourth Commandment a Catholic loves his own country above all, without wishing ill to any others.

Most important of all, if France had stayed Catholic, neither the politicians nor the people would have become the puppets that they are today of hidden puppet-masters, the Globalists. In the 17th century France was Catholic as a whole, but in the 18th century, for lack of Catholic faith, its ruling class allowed itself to become thoroughly infected with another form of Globalism, Freemasonry. Launched in its modern form

in apostate England in 1717, Freemasonry swiftly spread to France and North America where it master-minded the American and French Revolutions in 1776 and 1789 respectively. Both of them were major steps towards the Globalists' New World Order.

Now, for as long as the Catholic Church was still in its right mind, it denounced and condemned Freemasonry as being a secret society designed to undermine and overthrow the Catholic religion altogether – see for instance Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter, *Humanum Genus* of 1884. Thus from the French Revolution onwards, States have been ever more separated from the Catholic Church and have been put instead on secular and democratic foundations. More and more the new middle-class rulers have abandoned the Catholic religion in favour of liberalism, which is in effect a substitute religion, adoring man and his liberty instead of God and his Truth. So in the name of “freedom” journalists took over from priests, and their liberal media took over the people's thinking. But all the while journalists and media have been secretly directed by Freemasonry, working for the Globalists' New World Order. Here is how, under cover of “democracy” and “freedom,” the highly motivated Globalists have been able to reduce peoples and politicians to puppets of public opinion, moulded by their media. To turn one's back on God's Truth is to enslave oneself to Satan's lies.

The Charlie Hebdo attack was designed for a huge demonstration to favour godless liberty, or rather licence, and a murderous muslim-European tension. More such events will follow, to arrive at bloodbaths from which the Globalists count on emerging supreme, from which Almighty God hopes that men will see that rejecting him is a huge problem, the basic problem. If the States will not see this, it remains only for families to pray the five Mysteries a day, and individuals the fifteen a day (if reasonably possible), to beg Our Lady to intercede with her Son.

Kyrie eleison.

NEWSOCIETY THINKING – I

No. CCCXCV (395)

February 7, 2015

When Father Pfluger speaks, what do we hear?
The religion of man, the Council, loud and clear.

Towards the end of last year, the second-in-command of the Newsociety of St Pius X, Fr. Niklaus Pfluger, gave an interview to a Newsociety magazine in Germany, *Der Gerade Weg*, in which he answered seven questions ranging over the Church, Tradition, the “Resistance” and the XSPX. Given his important position, his thinking cannot be without interest. Its main lines are presented here below, and then its main flaw.

The Catholic Church is broad, much broader than just the Traditional movement. This movement began in the 1970’s as an understandable reaction of Catholics rendered homeless by the Conciliar revolution, but we will never make Tradition attractive or convincing if we remain mentally stuck in the 1950’s or 1970’s. Catholic Tradition is a vast treasure, not to be confined within the condemnations, which were routine in the 19th and 20th centuries, of modernism, liberalism and Freemasonry. In the 1970’s and 1980’s the SSPX did act as a lifeboat for souls drowning, but in 2014 “our time is different, we cannot stand still.” Church Tradition is one, but traditions are many, and much that is modern is not immoral.

So “we must continually re-position ourselves,” somewhere between denying that there is any crisis of modernism at all in the Church, and denying Church reality, as does the “Resistance.” They turn a purely practical problem of re-positioning into a question of faith, but that “faith” is a fabrication of their own, subjective, personal and in extreme denial of reality — how can Rome not be Catholic? How can Bishop Fellay be Enemy Number One? Ridiculous! The “Resistance” is sectarian, narrow-minded, evil-spirited and divisive.

As for SSPXHQ having betrayed Tradition in 2012, its actions were attacked from both sides, so it acted with reasonable moderation. Its texts were not dogmatic, just responding to circumstances. It did depart from General Chapter decisions of 2006, but who back then could imagine how much less aggressive towards the SSPX Rome

would become by 2012? In 2014 our three bishops could all celebrate public Masses in the Basilica of Lourdes!

In brief, the SSPX follows the Spirit, It draws on Tradition. It saved the liturgy (thanks to Archbishop Lefebvre). It is neither monopolistic, nor as disunited or defeated as it may seem. Storms in the Church do continue, but down with conspiracy theories and Apocalypticism, and up with faith, hope and a new youth! (See francefidele.org for the original in German, and a French translation; see ablefebvreforums or cathinfo.com for an English translation)

So where is the flaw in Fr Pfluger's thinking? It is most clearly seen in the first paragraph above, where he suggests that Tradition can thrive outside of the "19th and 20th century condemnations of modernism, liberalism and Freemasonry." For Fr Pfluger, as for all liberals, these condemnations are not integral to the Catholic Faith but merely "substantial anchorages" (Cardinal Ratzinger's own expression), which in a different age the ship of the Church can leave behind, as corresponding no longer to the different circumstances. Therefore if Fr Pfluger does not have a different faith from that of Archbishop Lefebvre, Pius IX, St Pius X, Pius XII, etc., he certainly has a different concept of that Faith, and that different concept underlies all his remarks in the interview quoted.

Thus the problem is much more than just "practical re-positioning." Today's Rome is indeed not Catholic. Bishop Fellay is a huge problem. The 2006 General Chapter was implicitly dogmatic. Tradition is not to be made attractive to men, but true to God (mentioned only once, passingly, in the interview). The "Resistance" is far from creating its own "faith." And so on and so on.

Kyrie eleison.

NEWSOCIETY THINKING – II

No. CCCXCVI (396)

February 14, 2015

Dear Newsociety followers all – beware!
The poison is running deep, so take deep care.

Some 650 words of a single “Eleison Comments” are by no means enough to make clear the enormous problem posed by the interview given by the Newsociety’s First Assistant to a Newsociety magazine in Germany towards the end of last year (cf. last week’s EC). Fr. Pfluger’s thinking springs from the poisonous modern mentality, so that it is not surprising if Archbishop Lefebvre’s Society of St Pius X (SSPX) is being poisoned from top to bottom and changed into Bishop Fellay’s Newsociety (XSPX). The poison consists in the move from God to man; from the religion of God to the religion of man; from the truths of God to the liberties of man; from the doctrine of Christ (“Going, TEACH all nations” – Mt. XXVIII, 19) to the uniting of mankind.

Like millions upon millions of modern men, thousands upon thousands of churchmen in high office and all too many priests and layfolk of what was once the SSPX, Fr Pfluger does not understand the crucial importance to the Church of Catholic doctrine. “INDOCTRINATE all nations,” Our Lord could have said. Why? Because all men are created by God to go to Heaven (I Tim. II, 4). This they can only do by Jesus Christ (Acts IV, 12), by firstly believing in Jesus Christ (Jn. I, 12), which they can only do by hearing about the Faith (Rom. X, 17), in other words by hearing Catholic DOCTRINE. For someone to be disinterested in Catholic doctrine means that he is not interested in going to Heaven. Good luck to him, wherever he will spend his eternity!

Now from start to finish Fr Pfluger’s German interview betrays his relative disinterest in Catholic doctrine, but as last week’s “Comments” declared, that disinterest is most clearly betrayed by his implicit disparaging (not too strong a word) of the great anti-liberal, anti-Masonic, anti-modernist documents, notably Papal Encyclicals, of the 19th and 20th centuries, let us say from Mirari Vos of 1831 to Humani Generis of 1950. To Fr Pfluger’s way of thinking, probably these “anti” documents seem merely negative, whereas Catholic doctrine is essentially positive. One might as well think

that medicine is merely negative, while health is essentially positive. But medicine can be essential to preserving health, for goodness' sake! However, why are the Encyclicals such necessary medicine for the health of the Church today?

Because man is not made to live alone (Rousseau's noble savage), he is by nature a social animal (Aristotle) – observe the thousand ways in which men get together. Now the French Revolution of 1789, by spurning Aristotle and following Rousseau, overthrew the natural basis of society and placed it on merely man-made foundations instead, hostile to human nature as designed by God, and therefore hostile to God. Therefore as the Revolutionary ideas advanced, through France, Europe and the world, so the Catholic Church found itself in a more and more hostile social environment, because the profound influence that any society has upon the individuals belonging to it has been working more and more against God and against the salvation of souls.

For a long time the Catholic Popes were not deceived, and they revived the medicine of the Church's true social doctrine to apply it through their Encyclicals to the sickness of Revolutionary mankind. Thus the Encyclicals teach nothing but the Church's age-old doctrine on the nature of human society between man and God, that social doctrine which it had not been necessary to repeat for as long as it had gone without saying. Thus the Encyclicals are not an unfortunate accident of unfortunate times in the past. They are central to the defence of the Faith in the present, as Archbishop Lefebvre so well learned from Fr Le Floch. But then came "good" Pope John to declare that modern man is no longer sick, and now comes Fr. Pfluger. More next week.

Kyrie eleison.

NEWSOCIETY THINKING – III

No. CCCXCVII (397)

February 21, 2015

Does the Society want Conciliar Rome?
If not, wake up! Soon it will be your home.

These “Comments” having declared (395) that the Newsociety’s First Assistant lacks doctrine, and (396) that this lack of doctrine is a problem as broad as broad can be, namely the whole of modernity against the whole of Truth, it remains now to show how this universal problem manifests itself in a series of particular errors in the interview that Fr Pfluger gave in Germany towards the end of last year. For brevity we will have to make use of the summary of his thinking (not essentially unfair) given here two weeks ago. Propositions from it are in italics:—

The Catholic Church is much broader than just the Traditional movement.

Yes, but the Traditional movement’s doctrine is no more nor less broad than the Catholic Church’s doctrine, being identical with it, and that doctrine is the heart and soul of the Traditional movement.

We will never make Tradition attractive or convincing if we remain stuck in the 1950’s or 1970’s.

To think of making Tradition “attractive or convincing” is too human a way of conceiving it. Catholic Tradition comes from God, and it has a divine power to convince and attract, so long as it is presented faithfully, without human change or alteration.

Tradition cannot be confined within the 19th and 20th century Church condemnations of liberalism.

True, but the Gospel could not then be defended without those doctrinal condemnations, and since the 21st century is more liberal than ever, Tradition cannot be maintained without them today.

Our time is different, we cannot stand still, much that is modern is not immoral.

Our time is not so very different. It is more liberal than ever (e.g. homosexual “marriages”), so it may not all be immoral, but Catholic doctrine is absolutely needed to sift moral from immoral.

So we must re-position ourselves, which is a practical problem and not a question of Faith.

Any re-positioning that the Church ever does must always be judged in the light of the Faith. The XSPX’s re-positioning since 2012 is clearly leaving behind the Archbishop’s fight for the Faith.

The “Resistance” movement has fabricated its own “faith” by which to condemn the Newsociety.

Whatever the human failings of the “Resistance,” it has, just like the Traditional movement in the 1970’s, arisen spontaneously all over the world in reaction against the Newsociety’s betrayal. The reaction may seem disjointed, but it is held together by the identical Faith held by Resistant.

SSPX HQ never betrayed Tradition in 2012 because its actions were attacked from both sides.

So the Truth is always in the middle, to be measured by human reactions? That is human politics, inadequate to judge of divine Truth, absolutely inadequate to solve today’s crisis of the Church.

The official Newsociety texts of 2012 were not dogmatic.

But the most official XSPX document of all in 2012 was the General Chapter’s six conditions for any future “agreement” with Rome, i.e. the six gravely inadequate conditions for submitting the defence of the Faith to its deadly Conciliar enemies. Is the whole Faith not dogmatic?

Rome was much less aggressive in 2012 to the XSPX than it was in 2006.

Because from 2006, and before, Rome could see the SSPX steadily turning into a paper tiger.

The Newsociety follows the Spirit and draws on Tradition.

The neo-protestant Charismatics “follow the Spirit.” The Indulterers “draw on

Tradition.”

It should be clear by now that Fr Pfluger wants to leave behind the doctrinal anti-liberal Society of Archbishop Lefebvre, and to reshape it into a Newsociety that will harmonize with the Newchurch of Vatican II. Nor is it enough to say that no decisive step has yet been taken by the XSPX towards Rome, because unless there is a firm resistance, and soon, from within the Newsociety, its leaders are taking it, slowly but surely, into the arms of Conciliar Rome. Is that what Catholics want?

Kyrie eleison.

ENCOURAGING SIGN

No. CCCXCVIII (398)

February 28, 2015

A bishop said, Tradition must testify.
Bishop, please do that more, lest the sheep die.

After three issues of these “Comments” have tried to show the new way of thinking by which Archbishop Lefebvre’s Society of St Pius X is being poisoned to death, let us present one encouraging sign that his Society is not yet completely dead: quotes from a sermon given on January 1 of this year in Chicago by Bishop Tissier de Mallerais, one of the four bishops consecrated for the SSPX in 1988. People often ask why so little is heard of him, because he is known to be a timid but honest man with a strong faith, a clear mind and a great knowledge and love of the Archbishop. Maybe he has loved the Society “not wisely, but too well,” so that he has not seen, or has not wanted to see, how its leadership has for many years been slowly but surely betraying the Archbishop’s fight for the Faith. Has the Bishop been putting the Society’s unity in front of the Church’s Faith? But last month he said several things that could not be said better.

He quoted the Archbishop writing in his *Spiritual Journey* (Ch III, p.13): “It is, therefore, a strict duty for every priest wanting to remain Catholic to separate himself from the Conciliar Church for as long it does not rediscover the Tradition of the Church and of the Catholic Faith.” Then, for emphasis, Bishop Tissier said, “Let me repeat that,” and he read out the quote once more.

Next he referred to the evil forces occupying the Church. Then he warned against “false friends” who maintain wrongly that if the SSPX remains “separated from the visible Church,” it will turn into a sect. He declared on the contrary that “we are the visible Church” and that “we are in the Church.”

Finally he warned against “false friends” who claim that the SSPX is in an abnormal situation because we are not “recognized by the Church” and he declared that it is Rome’s situation, not ours, which is abnormal, that the Society does not need to “come back,” because it is these Romans who have to come back. “We do not need to be looking for what we can do in Rome, but rather for what testimony we can give to

the whole Church by being a light on a candlestick and not under a bushel.”

Bishop Tissier’s line of thinking, as expressed in these quotes, is exactly that of the Archbishop. The modernist cuckoos now occupying the nightingales’ nest, i.e. the structures of the true Church, may present the appearance of nightingales, but their song, ie. doctrine, doctrine, doctrine, immediately gives them away. In reality they are nothing but cuckoos, with no right to be occupying that nest. The true nest does not make their doctrine true. Their false doctrine makes false their occupying of that nest. They may be visible in that nest, but, as their doctrine shows, they are not true nightingales. Wherever the remainder of the true nightingales are visibly gathered, in whatever makeshift nest, they are in the Church, they are the true visible Church, and their beautiful song testifies to anyone who has ears to hear that the cuckoos are nothing but cuckoos who have stolen the Catholic nest which they presently occupy.

Alas, the present leaders of the XSPX are tone deaf, will not distinguish the song of cuckoos from that of nightingales, and so judge of Catholicism by the appearances of the nest instead of by the reality of the song. What Bishop Tissier said here must have displeased them greatly. Without any doubt they will have brought pressure to bear, skilfully calculated, to make sure that he steps back in line, their line. And out of “obedience,” he risks doing just that. We must pray for him.

SICKNESS UNIMAGINABLE

No. CCCXCIX (399)

March 7, 2015

In modern Popes such sickness do we find
As can't be grasped by any healthy mind.

In the Society of St Pius X's "hot summer" of 1976, after Paul VI "suspended" Archbishop Lefebvre for ordaining 14 priests for Tradition, the clash between Pope and Catholic Tradition was so sharp that one of the two moments occurred that August when the Archbishop most seriously considered whether the See of Rome might be vacant. As can be heard from the recording of words he then spoke, he was agonizing over that clash: how possibly could a true Vicar of Christ be so destroying the Church? The Archbishop never finally adopted the sedevacantist solution, but let us see how clearly he stated the problem, and then offer once more a line of solution which he may have been too sane in mind to think of. Here is a summary of his words in August of 1976:—

People ask me what I think of the Pope [Paul VI]. It is an incredible mystery. The true Pope is the unity of the Church, inspired by the Holy Ghost, and protected by the promise of Our Lord in upholding the Faith. But in the aftermath of Vatican II, Paul VI is systematically destroying the Church. Nothing is spared: catechism, universities, Congregations, seminaries, schools. Everything Catholic is being destroyed. One looks for a solution.

A series of false solutions can be dismissed out of hand, e.g. Paul VI is a prisoner, drugged, victim of his underlings, etc. For when he blessed the Charismatics or kissed the feet of the Orthodox Patriarch, did he have a revolver at his head? I have watched him in public audiences, speaking with the skill, presence of mind, pertinence and intelligence of a man in full possession of his faculties. Cardinal Benelli told me that it was the Pope himself who wrote those letters to me [crushing Tradition], that he is fully informed, that he knows exactly what he is doing, it is his will, they are his decisions. The Cardinal said that he reported to the Pope every day, and would do so again, straight after our own conversation.

Then can Paul VI be not a true Pope? That is one possible hypothesis. Theologians

have studied the problem. I do not know. Do not put words in my mouth. But the problem seems theologically insoluble.

The Archbishop spoke of Paul VI, but the problem is essentially the same for all six Conciliar Popes (except perhaps John-Paul I). Let us divide the problem in two: how can the true God allow such destruction of his Church? How can his true Vicars be the main destroyers?

As for Almighty God, firstly the destruction will be still worse at world's end (Lk. XVIII, 8). Secondly, God may easily be purifying his Church to prepare for the Triumph of his Mother's Immaculate Heart. Thirdly, God did protect Paul VI from utterly destroying the Church, when for instance he arranged for the "chance" discovery to Paul VI of a plan to dissolve the Papacy by the text of *Lumen Gentium*. This enabled the Pope to block the plan by adding the *Nota Praevia*.

As for the Vicars, Archbishop Lefebvre never seems to have considered the solution which follows, which may be why in that August even he seems to have been nearly impaled on the horns of the sedevacantist-or-liberal dilemma. But if with each year liberalism comes closer to confusing the mind of every man on earth, how should the Popes escape the universal malady of being "sincerely" wrong? Because they are educated men? But liberalism reigns especially in the schools and universities. So if the miseducated Conciliar Popes are "sincerely" convinced that "truth" evolves, they will not even by their grave errors be pertinaciously denying what they know to be defined Catholic Truth, because even defined Truth, if it is to be for them "truth," evolves in their direction.

Kyrie eleison.

CHAOS RETURNED

No. CD (400)

March 14, 2015

As the Conciliar Church in chaos sinks,
'Tis a gift of God if anyone still thinks.

A fascinating paragraph from the book *Iota Unum*, written by the Italian layman Romano Amerio and much admired by Archbishop Lefebvre, has already been quoted in these "Comments." In the book Amerio takes apart in masterly fashion all the doctrinal errors of Vatican II. In section #319 he writes: (1) If the present crisis is tending to overthrow the nature of the Church, and if (2) this tendency is internal to the Church rather than the result of an external assault as it has been on other occasions, then (3) we are headed for a formless darkness that will make analysis and forecast impossible, and (4) in the face of which there will be no alternative but to keep silence (English edition, p.713; Italian edition, p. 594).

This is strong meat, if one thinks about it. Amerio is saying we are on the brink of chaos, because of course (1) the present crisis is both tending to overthrow the nature of the Church and (2) it is internal to the Church, when the Pope himself is making statements like, "There is no Catholic God," and "Homosexuals need to be evaluated," statements whose deliberate ambiguity opens the door wide to the overthrow of all Catholic dogma and morals. But why should (3) Catholic analysis and forecast become impossible, and (4) how can there be nothing more to say? How can Amerio draw such a dark conclusion?

Because Our Lord says, "I am the light of the world. He that followeth me, walketh not in darkness" (Jn.VIII, 12), which strongly suggests that the mass of the world's population that does not now follow him is already in darkness. He also says to those that do follow him, "You are the light of the world" (Mt.V, 14), which strongly suggests that if convinced Catholics are fewer by the day, then the darkness in Church and world is growing darker by the day. Alright, one might say, but darkness is only a metaphor. Why should Catholic analysis and forecast become impossible?

(3) Because more and more people today are unable to think. Because ever since Our Lord with his Incarnation brought supernatural grace to the rescue of wounded and

struggling nature, that nature has no longer been able to stand upright without that grace. So when men turn their backs on Jesus Christ and God, they are undermining their own nature, and they repudiate that common sense with which they are endowed by nature to think, as to the content of their thinking in accordance with reality, and as to its procedure in accordance with logic. They want freedom from reality and logic in order to defy God, by remaking the world in accordance with their fantasy.

It follows that if Jesus Christ came to the rescue of mankind and of human nature through establishing his Catholic Church, and if at Vatican II the Gentiles too finally repudiated that Church, then the process of men tearing themselves and their nature and their thinking to pieces took at the Council such a huge step forward that it is virtually irreversible. Here is how Amerio can see, implicit in Vatican II, a “formless darkness” of which the belligerent chaos of opinions proudly today prancing on the Internet might serve as an example and a foretaste.

But (4) why not cry out in that darkness? Why should there be “no alternative but to keep silence”? Because in a chaotic din the truth simply cannot be heard, except, one might add, by a few souls whom God has preordained to hear it (Acts XIII, 48).

These souls are chosen by God, not by men, and they can come from the most surprising backgrounds. They do not like “formless darkness,” and Our Lord leads them to the Father (Jn.XIV, 6). They will be an important help for the Church and a hope of the world.

Kyrie eleison.

EMOTIONAL ARGUING

No. CDI (401)

March 21, 2015

Sedevacs say: “True Popes we have not had.”
Instincts are good, but reasoning is bad.

An old-fashioned comparison has the advantage of being very clear: on the back of a mule a heavy pack can be difficult to balance. If it shifts to the left, one must push it to the right. If it tilts to the right, it must be pushed to the left. But such double pushing is not contrary – it has the single purpose of keeping the pack balanced. Similarly, for these “Comments” to argue repeatedly against sedevacantism is not to push towards liberalism, nor is it to suggest that sedevacantism is as bad as liberalism. It is merely to recognize that the outrageous words and deeds of the present occupant of the Holy See are tempting many good Catholics to renounce their reason and to judge of reality by their emotions. That is a common practice today, but it is not Catholic.

For instance sedevacantist arguments are, upon examination, never as strong as they can seem. Let us look at two that have crossed my desk recently, both from devout Catholics, strong in the Faith. Here is the first: Conciliar Popes, especially Francis, have not confirmed their brethren in the Faith. But it is of the essence of a Pope to do that. Therefore the Conciliar Popes are not essentially Popes. In reply one must distinguish a Pope in his being from a Pope in his action. A Pope becomes essentially Pope in his being by his valid election in a Conclave of Cardinals, or by his election, if it was invalid in itself, being convalidated by his subsequent acceptance as Pope by the Universal Church (which may have been the case for more than one Conciliar Pope, God knows). On the contrary, by confirming his brethren in the Faith a Pope is essentially Pope in his action. The two things are different and can be separated. Therefore a Pope can fail in action without necessarily ceasing to be a Pope in his being. That is surely the case of several, if not all, the Conciliar Popes.

And here is the second argument: for the individual and fallible Catholic to set himself up as judge of error by the Church’s infallible Magisterium is ridiculous. Faced then by obvious error (e.g. Conciliarism) by that Magisterium (e.g. the Conciliar Popes), he can only conclude that they have not been true Popes. But, in reply, the

Pope is not necessarily the Church's infallible Magisterium. If he neither engages all four strict conditions of the Extraordinary Magisterium, nor teaches in accordance with the Church's Ordinary Magisterium, then he is fallible, and if he contradicts that Ordinary Magisterium then he is certainly in error, and can be judged to be such by any Catholic (or non-Catholic!) making the right use of his God-given mind. Otherwise how could Our Lord have warned us to beware of false prophets and of wolves in sheeps' clothing (Mt. VII, 15–20)?

In fact both arguments can come from an emotional rejection of the Conciliar Popes: "They have so maltreated the Church that I simply cannot accept that they were Popes!" But what if I had been a bystander watching the original Way of the Cross? – "This is such maltreatment of Jesus that I simply cannot accept any longer that he is the Son of God!" Would not my emotional rejection of the maltreatment have been right, and yet my conclusion wrong? There is a mystery involved in the Conciliar Popes which sedevacantism passes by.

Now it may be, when the Church one day comes back to her senses, that the alone competent authority will declare that the Conciliar Popes were not Popes, but between now and then the arguments so far brought forward to prove the See of Rome to be vacant are not as conclusive as they can be made to appear.

Kyrie eleison.

NEW BISHOP

No. CDII (402)

March 28, 2015

St Joseph, Church's Patron, many thanks
For thus extending her true bishops' ranks!

Fr. Jean-Michel Faure's consecration as bishop at the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Brazil last week was a delightful occasion. The weather was warm and dry. The sun shone. Fr Thomas Aquinas' monks and the nearby Sisters had excelled themselves in transforming a concrete and metal garage into a sanctuary worthy of the noble liturgy, which they had also very well prepared. Despite the late notice, a group of priests was present from all over the Americas and France, and a congregation of a hundred souls, also from many different countries, followed attentively the three-hour ceremony.

Since then all Catholics have rejoiced who see the need for at least one more bishop to help ensure the survival of a "Resistant Tradition." Archbishop Lefebvre's understanding of the defence of the Catholic Faith could not be left for very much longer to depend on one bishop alone. His consecration of four bishops in 1988 without Rome's permission, by "Operation Survival" as opposed to "Operation Suicide," had to be extended into the 21st century. Apologies go to all Catholics who would love to have attended if only they had had enough notice, but everything had to be done, including a measure of discretion, to make sure that the consecration would take place.

It had powerful adversaries. The official Church in Rome reacted by declaring the consecrator to be "automatically excommunicated," but as in 1988 this declaration is false, because by Church Law whoever commits a punishable act does not incur the normal penalty, e.g. excommunication for consecrating a bishop without Rome's permission, if he acted out of necessity. That is common sense, and there was certainly necessity here. As the world draws closer and closer to World War III, what individual on earth can be sure of his own survival?

Also the official Society of St Pius X in Menzingen, Switzerland, condemned Bishop Faure's consecration in a press statement issued on the day itself. Worthy of note in it is the admission that the consecrator was excluded from the Society in 2012 because of

his “vigorous criticism” of the Society’s contacts with Rome in recent years. Menzingen claimed for the longest time that the problem was one of “disobedience.” Now at last Menzingen admits that it was being steadily accused of “betraying Archbishop Lefebvre’s work.” Indeed. Betraying and destroying.

Rome itself confirms the betrayal. On the day after the consecration, Monsignor Guido Pozzo, Secretary of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, besides declaring the non-existent “excommunication,” went on to say, Several meetings (between Rome and the SSPX) have taken place and more are planned with certain (Roman) prelates, to go into the problems still needing to be cleared up in a relationship of trust,” problems “doctrinal and internal to the Society.”

Monsignor Pozzo went on: The Pope is waiting for the Society to make up its mind to enter the Church, and we are always ready with a familiar canonical project (a personal prelature). A little time is needed for things to become clear within the Society and for Bishop Fellay to obtain a broad enough consensus before taking this step.

What more can anyone need to see the writing on the wall?

Kyrie eleison.

SICKNESS IMAGINED

No. CDIII (403)

April 4, 2015

Conciliar Popes Our Lord would seem to have dropped?
Not if their total loss of faith he stopped.

The iniquity of true Popes steadily destroying everything Catholic is so mysterious that in these “Comments” four weeks ago we saw Archbishop Lefebvre considering seriously whether the See of Rome might be vacant. He would never pretend with the liberals that the destruction is not really destruction, but at the same time his sense of the Church was too strong for him ever to adopt the sedevacantist solution, so at least in August of 1976 the problem seemed to him “theologically insoluble.” These “Comments” suggested that there might be another line of solution which people as sane of mind as the Archbishop could hardly imagine. Let us try to imagine it.

To ridicule this solution a hard-bitten sedevacantist once dubbed it “mentevacantism,” but the label will do. It means not the See of Rome being vacant, but the Popes’ minds being vacant, or let us say, their minds having had the sense of reality emptied out of them, their minds being empty of reality. Especially since the Protestant Reformation, men have been steadily more liberating themselves from God. To do this they must liberate their minds from the reality around them, because all reality comes from God and points back to God. Here is the liberal illusion, the ultimate liberation, known otherwise as “mind-rot,” “mental sickness” or “mentevacantism,” because the human mind was designed by God to run on reality and not on fantasy or illusion.

Now from 1517 to 1958 the Catholic Popes resisted and beat back the mind-rot steadily engulfing the rest of the world, on its slow way to its end, but all too many of the Catholic laity, priests, bishops and finally cardinals were being progressively infected with the liberal illusion, coming to be convinced that it would create a brave new Church for the Brave New World. So in the papal Conclave of 1958, even if Cardinal Siri was validly elected, the liberals had the power to force the election of John XXIII upon the Conclave, and then by convalidation upon the Universal Church.

But what is a liberal? He is a dreamer, living not in the real world but in a Wonderland of man's own fabrication. However, as more and more human minds switch off reality and launch into the dream, so he has less and less chance of realizing what he has done, because more and more the world all around him is being taken over by the Wonderland. This means that in modern times it is easier and easier for a man – and every Pope remains a man – to be objectively in Wonderland and yet subjectively convinced that he is in reality. Here is that mental sickness observed at first hand by an SSPX priest in all four Roman “theologians” taking part in the Rome-SSPX Discussions of 2009–2011 (Note the inverted commas – in Wonderland everything is an unreal imitation of the real, so that without some such sign as the inverted commas, we easily take the imitation for the reality.)

On this reckoning the Conciliar Popes are, at least in part, “sincerely” wrong. What that “sincerity” is internally worth, God alone can judge. But externally it is an objective reality, more and more around us day by day. Then the Conciliar Popes are not wholly conscious villains, because in their sick minds they are serving the true Church by changing the old Church out of all recognition, by Wonderlanding it. Now their subjectively good intentions have objectively paved the way to Hell for the real true Church, but can one not say that these good intentions show that the prayer of Our Lord has prevented their faith from failing completely (cf. Lk.XXII, 32)? Even Paul VI condemned contraception, issued a relatively good “Credo,” wept for the loss of vocations, and spoke of the smoke of Satan entering the Church after Vatican II. Then can one not say that even with Paul VI Our Lord kept his promise to look after Peter?

Kyrie eleison.

FAITH UNDERMINED

No. CDIV (404)

April 11, 2015

When Faith is not at stake, one must obey? –
The Society's faith is undermined today.

The editorial in a recent Priory bulletin of an honourable colleague of the Society of St Pius X shows one major reason why Society priests are not yet joining the "Resistance" – they do not yet believe that the Faith is at stake. We wonder what it will take to persuade them. We can be sure that the leaders in XSPX headquarters are convinced that they are not themselves changing the Faith, and that they find it that much easier to continue persuading Society priests and laity that they are not changing the Faith. But if they had the true Faith, how could they dream of putting its Lefebvrian defence under the neo-modernists' control in Rome?

The editorial is entitled "Obeying Fallible Superiors." It recognizes that resistance to fallible Superiors is legitimate when the Faith is at stake, but the editorial's emphasis is rather on the limits to be set to such resistance: anarchy and disrespect for authority are never lawful; obedience to lawful Superiors is essential to any society; Superiors have special graces of state; care must be taken in warning sheep that cannot make the necessary distinctions; there is a dangerous spirit of independence abroad today (Benedict XV); name-calling should be avoided, etc. – the principles are impeccable, the problem lies in their application.

For instance, while shunning name-calling the editorial nevertheless recognizes that Pius IX named "liberal Catholics" as being the Church's "worst enemies." Indeed in any Church crisis to identify and name the Church's enemies, e.g. "Protestants" in the Reformation, is a major first step towards being able to fight them. No doubt the editorial's author would grant as much where the Faith is at stake, only he would deny that there is any crisis of the Faith taking place within the Society. But, Father, do you think that liberal Catholics of the 19th century who came under Pius IX's condemnation would have denied a single Article of the Faith? On the contrary, they would have vigorously affirmed their belief in every such Article. And yet would they not with equal vigour have condemned Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors? The problem for

a modern mind to be Catholic lies not in its accepting or rejecting any one truth of the Faith, but in its instinctive undermining of all truths whatsoever, and this dreadful dissolution of the mind is, without a divine miracle, a virtually insoluble problem for and of the Faith.

And it has reached to the top of the Society. Father, do you recognize that Benedict XVI's "hermeneutic of continuity" is tantamount to the suspension of the law of non-contradiction? And have you studied paragraph III.5 of Bishop Fellay's Doctrinal Declaration of April, 2012, a document which he circumstantially "withdrew," but never substantially retracted? It states that non-Traditional statements of Vatican II must be interpreted as Traditional. Is that not a perfect example of the "hermeneutic of continuity," of interpretation overtaking reality? Then do you really think that the Society has no problem of the Faith when its Superior joins in Rome's suspending the law of non-contradiction, and swims in contradictions and in what Churchill graciously named "terminological inexactitudes," as happily as a fish swims in water?

By the way, you also say that anybody who "doubts that hierarchy can still exist in the early 21st century excludes himself from all Catholic life." If he doubts it in principle, one might agree with you, but if he is merely relating what he observes in practice, might he not be merely observing the extension one century later of what you quote Benedict XV already observing as "the dangerous spirit of independence abroad" in 1914?

Kyrie eleison.

VACANCY SENSE – I

No. CDV (405)

April 18, 2015

Church Councils can heretical Popes untie,
For Christ to depose, lest the whole Church die.

The Dominican priests of Avrillé, France, have done us all a great favour by republishing the considerations on the vacant See of Rome written some 400 years ago by a famous thomist theologian from Spain, John of St Thomas (1589–1644). Being a faithful successor of St Thomas

Aquinas, he benefits from that higher wisdom of the Middle Ages when theologians could still measure men by God instead of having to measure God by men, a tendency which began as a necessity (if souls could no longer take medieval penicillin, they had to take a lesser medicine), but which culminated in Vatican II. Here, much abbreviated, are the main ideas of John of St Thomas on the deposition of a Pope:—

I Can a Pope be deposed?

Answer, yes, because Catholics are obliged to separate themselves from heretics, after the heretics have been warned (Titus III, 10). Also, a heretical Pope puts the whole Church in a state of legitimate self-defence. But the Pope must be warned first, as officially as possible, in case he would retract. Also his heresy must be public, and declared as officially as possible, to prevent wholesale confusion among Catholics, by their being bound to follow.

II By whom must he be officially declared a heretic?

Answer, not by the Cardinals because although they may elect a Pope, they cannot depose one, because it is the Universal Church that is threatened by a heretical Pope, and so the most universal possible authority of the Church can alone depose him, namely a Church Council composed of a quorum of all the Church's Cardinals and Bishops. These would be convoked not authoritatively (which the Pope alone can do) but among themselves.

III By what authority would a Church Council depose the Pope?

(Here is the main difficulty because Christ gives to the Pope supreme power over the entire Church, with no exception, as Vatican I defined in 1870. Already John of St Thomas gave arguments of authority, reason and Canon Law to prove this supreme power of the Pope. Then how can a Council, being beneath the Pope, yet depose him? John of St Thomas adopts the solution laid out by another famous Dominican theologian, Thomas Cajetan (1469–1534). The Church's deposition of the Pope would fall not upon the Pope as Pope, but upon the bond between the man and his Papacy. That may seem hair-splitting, but it is logical.)

On the one hand not even a Church Council has authority over the Pope. On the other hand the Church is obliged to avoid heretics and to protect the sheep. Therefore, just as in a Conclave the Cardinals are the ministers of Christ to bind this man to the Papacy, but Christ alone gives him his papal authority, so the Church Council would be the ministers of Christ to unbind this heretic from the Papacy by their solemn declaration, but Christ alone, by his divine authority over the Pope, would authoritatively depose him. In other words, the Church Council would be deposing the Pope not authoritatively from above, but only ministerially from below. John of St Thomas confirms this conclusion from the Church's Canon Law, which states in several places that God alone can depose the Pope, but the Church can pass judgment on his heresy.

Alas, as the Dominicans of Avrillé point out, nearly all Cardinals and Bishops of the Church today are so largely infected with modernism that there is no human hope of a Church Council seeing clear to condemn the modernism of the Conciliar Popes. We can only pray and wait for the divine solution, which will come in God's good time. To follow, is a Pope not automatically deposed by his mere heresy?

Kyrie eleison.

CULTURE MATTERS!

No. CDVI (406)

April 25, 2015

Come listen to Dr White, if still you can,
To relate the true Faith truly to modern man.

From Friday evening, May 1st, to Sunday mid-day, May 3rd, there will be held here in Queen of Martyrs House, Broadstairs, another seminar by Dr. David White, as last year on Charles Dickens, so this year on T.S. Eliot (1888–1965), another giant of English literature with a direct connection to this corner of England. It was in an open-air pavilion overlooking Margate beach about five miles north of Broadstairs that between October and November of 1921 the world famous Anglo-American poet broke a writing-block and composed some 50 lines of the third of five parts of the most influential poem of the 20th century, at any rate in the English language, *The Wasteland* (1922).

The poem is a brilliant portrait of the nothingness in men's hearts and minds in the wake of World War I (1914–1918). In *The Wasteland* Eliot forged a new fragmentary way of writing poetry that captured the broken spiritual condition of modern man. By his broad and deep grasp of the artistic masterpieces from the past, notably Dante and Shakespeare, Eliot was able to give shape to the spiritual poverty of today. For instance in the six lines of the poem which are clearly connected to Margate, one of three working-class girls tells how she gave away her honour, for nothing, and to highlight the emptiness of the lives of all three maidens, their words are framed within fragments from the song of the three Rhine maidens who open and close the cosmic vision of Wagner's epic *Ring of the Nibelungs*.

Emptiness and nothingness. Why on earth should Catholics bother with such depressing authors? Salvation is by Our Lord Jesus Christ, not by culture, especially not by nihilistic culture. A particular answer concerns T S Eliot. A general answer concerns all "culture," defined as those stories, pictures and music with which all men of all ages cannot help furnishing and forming their hearts and minds.

As for T S Eliot, he himself soon dismissed *The Wasteland* as "rhythmic grumbling," and a few years later he became a member of the Church of England. He had given

brilliant expression to modern nothingness, but he did not wallow in it. He went on to write a number of plays and especially the long poem of the Four Quartets, which are by no means nihilistic, and about which Dr White, who loves Eliot, will also be talking in Broadstairs in a few days' time. Having grappled honestly with the problem, Eliot came up with no ostrich solution, like countless Catholics that have fallen for Vatican II.

For indeed culture in general is to religion (or irreligion) like the suburbs of a city are to the city centre. And just as a military general with the task of defending a city would be most foolish to leave the suburbs to be occupied by the enemy, so any Catholic concerned for his religion cannot be indifferent to the stories, pictures and music which are moulding the souls all around him. Of course religion (or irreligion) is central to a man's life, compared with which "culture" is peripheral, because men's culture is, deep down, a spin-off from their relation with their God. Nevertheless culture and religion interact. For instance, were so many Catholics not under the spell of "The Sound of Music," would they so easily have fallen for Vatican II? Or had the present leaders of the Society of St Pius X, by contrasting Catholic culture and modern anti-culture, grasped the depth of the modern problem, would they be now so intent on getting back under the perpetrators of Vatican II? Culture can matter like Heaven and Hell!

Kyrie eleison.

VACANCY SENSE – II

No. CDVII (407)

May 2, 2015

A heretic Pope is still the Church's head,
Although, as personal member, he is dead.

Concerning the deposition of a heretical Pope, the Traditional Dominicans of Avrillé in France have done us a great favour by publishing not only the classic considerations of John of St Thomas (cf. EC 405), but also those of other outstanding theologians. In brief, the best minds of the Church teach that a simple and popular argument today, namely that a heretical Pope cannot be a member of the Church and therefore all the less its head, is a little too simple. In brief, there is more to the Pope than just the individual Catholic who by falling into heresy loses the faith and with it his membership of the Church. For the Church, the Pope is much more than just an individual Catholic.

For clarity, let us present these theologians' arguments in the form of question and answer:—

First of all, is it possible for a Pope to fall into heresy?

If he engages all four conditions of his Extraordinary Magisterium, he cannot teach heresy, but that he can personally fall into heresy is the more probable opinion at least of older theologians.

Then if he does fall into heresy, does that not make him cease to be a member of the Church?

As an individual Catholic person, yes, but as Pope, not necessarily, because the Pope is much more than just an individual Catholic. As Augustine said, the priest is Catholic for himself, but he is priest for others. The Pope is Pope for the entire Church.

But supposing that the great majority of Catholics can see that he is a heretic, because it is obvious. Would not his heresy in that case make it impossible for him to be Pope any longer?

No, because even if his heresy were obvious, still many Catholics might deny it, for

instance out of “piety” towards the Pope, and therefore to prevent confusion from arising throughout the Church, an official declaration of the Pope’s heresy would be necessary to bind Catholics to stay united. Such a declaration would have to come from a Church Council, assembled for that purpose.

But if the heresy were public and obvious, surely that would be enough to depose him?

No, because firstly every heretic must be officially warned before being deposed, in case he would retract his heresy. And secondly, in Church or State every high official is serving the common good, and for the common good he must stay in office until he is officially deposed. So just as a bishop stays in office until he is deposed by the Pope, so the Pope stays in office until the official declaration of his heresy by a Church Council enables Christ to depose him (cf. EC 405).

But if a heretic is not a member of the Church, how can he be its head, the most important member?

Because his personal membership is a different thing from his official headship. By his personal membership he receives sanctification from the Church. By his official headship he gives official government to the Church. So by falling into heresy, he ceases to be a living member of the Church, that is true, but he does not thereby cease being able, even as a dead member, to govern the Church. His membership of the Church by faith and charity is incompatible with heresy, but his governing of the Church by his official jurisdiction, not requiring faith or charity, is compatible with heresy.

But by his heresy a former Pope has thrown away his Papacy!

Personally and in private that is true, but that is not true officially and in public until a Church Council has made not only public but also official his heresy. Until then the Pope must be treated as Pope, because for the Church’s tranquillity and common good, Christ maintains his jurisdiction.

Kyrie eleison.

“FOUND WANTING”

No. CDVIII (408)

May 9, 2015

Resistants, God seeks those who seek his will.
Seeking our Fifties' comfort must fare ill.

Catholics striving today to keep the Faith do not have an easy task. Here is the description by an observer of the present state of the Society of St Pius X in the USA as he sees it, both positive and negative. Let us take the negative first, not in order to spite the Society, but in order to take the measure of the problem. As the American patriot, Patrick Henry, said in 1775: “For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to hear the whole truth, to know the worst, and to provide for it.”

“Up till now the Society priests in the USA have not reacted to the Modernist infiltration of their Society. Most bend over backwards to justify every word and act of their Superior General. How they can justify the compromise in doctrine is a mystery to me. One of them says that just talking with Bishop Fellay will clarify everything. The handful of US seminarians that I have met with are being malformed, lost in justifying everything, even the ‘good’ found in Vatican II. Blind obedience is the drum they march to. Conspiracy theories are taboo in the seminary, so that as future priests they will be easy prey for the enemy. There was no reaction to the visit there of Novus Ordo Bishop Schneider, or to the ‘Argentinian assimilation.’ The ‘Resistance’ to Bishop Fellay’s modernism is absolutely not discussed, being dismissed as another revolt, like that of the ‘Nine’ priests in 1983.

“Yet SSPX Priors indiscriminately permit attendance at Masses of St Peter’s Fraternity, and they define Modernism as a ‘dust pile’ to be swept to one side. A newly ordained priest was sent to attend the installation of a local Novus Ordo bishop. Overall there is no fight against the errors of Vatican II, nor against the errors of the Society’s own Doctrinal Declaration of 2012. Worst of all is the doctrinal slide that has taken place within the Society since 2012, yet still SSPX priests are saying that they will take no action until they see something concrete.”

Such blindness can only be a punishment from God. What is he punishing? In the 1950’s Catholics seeking too much their own worldly comfort were punished by the

Council of the 1960's. To a faithful remnant God granted Archbishop Lefebvre, the true shepherd of the 1970's and 1980's.

Surely God was entitled in return to expect that these remnant Catholics would understand the problem, and flee the false solution of the 1950's. But no. Since the late 1990's the SSPX leaders and then priests and layfolk have been slowly but surely going back to "Fiftiesism," or to the "Sunday Catholicism" of the 1950's, which is a poor return on the multiple graces granted by him to the Society. It would seem that God has had enough. So he has, for instance, allowed a diocese in Argentina to set the example of granting official Church approval to the Society, dismissed by Society HQ as a "merely administrative measure," but paving the way for a Roman or diocese-by-diocese complete Church approval which everybody would pretend not to notice, but which almost everybody would rejoice in. These Romans are masters!

However, Almighty God is still raising a Resistant remnant out of the Traditional remnant. The observer quoted above concluded: "I think that when the chips all fall, there will be a handful of Nicodemuses and Josephs of Arimathea from among the Society priests and Brothers, and hopefully Sisters. The "Resistant" faithful throughout North America are steady, with occasional newcomers, mostly from the Novus Ordo, or from nothing." The same steadiness was evident in many Catholics' reactions to the consecration of Bishop Faure. Here is a future for souls. But let us make no mistake this time round: Almighty God wants no more Sunday Catholics. He wants potential martyrs.

Kyrie eleison.

SIN AVENGED

No. CDIX (409)

May 16, 2015

Whoever “God” is, his today the blame.
Yet who but men the Wrath Divine inflame?

Immersed as we all are in the world around us, it is difficult, especially for young people, to realize into what an abnormal condition it has brought itself. Never in all human history has God been so discredited, disbelieved, and in effect discarded from men’s lives. And since all sin is primarily an offence against God, then as men lose all sense of God, so they lose all sense of sin. Therefore men are always right, and “God,” whoever he may be, is always wrong, so that whenever things go wrong “he” can always be brought back long enough to take the blame.

This widely spread attitude makes it virtually impossible to understand the apparent severity of God in the Old Testament, where for instance he commands the Israelites to exterminate whole peoples, as in the book of Joshua. But Catholic Scripture scholars who have not lost their sense of the true and unchanging God, put things back in perspective. Here for instance is a summary of the commentary by a modern Benedictine, Dom Jean de Monléon (1890–1981), on the slaughter of the Canaanites by the Israelites under their leader, Joshua:—

As far as Joshua himself is concerned, he was acting not out of hatred, racism, greed, ambition or whatever, but under strict, precise and repeated orders from God himself. St John Chrysostom says that Joshua might personally have preferred some less murderous solution, but certainly God had his own reasons. These we cannot know for sure, but we can make reasonable guesses. To begin with, all of us human beings, by our original sin (What is that?” cries modern man), have to pay the debt of death, the time, manner and place of which are decided by the Master of Life and Death, who is God. For sinners like the Canaanites, to die sooner rather than later can be a mercy, especially if the manner of death gives them time to repent and so save their souls for eternity.

Next, the Canaanites were indeed sinners, immersed in the committing of terrible crimes, and like mankind before the Flood, like the Sodomites and Gomorrhans, they

had made the cup of God's wrath overflow: prostitution of all kinds, bestiality, incest, witchcraft and in particular, the ritual murder of children, as proved by multiple archaeological excavations in Palestine, whereby tiny skeletons have been uncovered in surroundings clearly identifying them as sacrificial victims, etc.

Moreover if the Canaanites were allowed to survive, they would present a grave danger of corrupting the Israelites, as subsequent history only too clearly showed.

In more recent times, some 400 years ago (but still before the advent of liberalism!), the first missionaries in Canada found themselves bound to conclude that the only way to deal with a certain tribe was to exterminate them. A canonized Saint said, "After repeated experience of their treachery, whether for peace or for the Faith, there is nothing further to be hoped for from them." (end of Dom Monléon summary)

This still shocks modern susceptibilities, but is it not simply tribal as opposed to individual capital punishment? The principle of capital punishment is that by such anti-social crimes as, for instance, murder, treason, counterfeiting, homosexuality, etc., men are capable of behaving in such a way as to render themselves unfit to live any more in society, and so society's legitimate authority has the right to take their lives (one may object that not all the individuals in a tribe will be equally guilty, but it should go without saying that Almighty God can and will make all the distinctions necessary).

The problem all comes down to disbelief in the greatness and goodness of God, but let us just say that the Old Testament is neither as cruel nor as out of date as it is often made to appear.

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIAR POPES I

No. CDX (410)

May 23, 2015

The world has always known bad Popes, but never
As in today's world more corrupt than ever.

Whenever the claim is put forward that the Conciliar Popes may be at least partly in good faith, there are usually Catholics that protest. They will say that the Popes are intelligent and educated churchmen, so it is impossible that they do not fully realize what they are doing. The “mentevacantist” theory, according to which these Popes have vacant minds, partly ignorant of the consequences of their own actions, is for these critics absurd. One can understand the protest, but let me quote a friend who understands “mentevacantism” as it needs to be understood:—

“The idea that Popes can be mistaken in good faith because they hold that certain errors are not opposed to the Faith, gets little serious attention, because people have a concept of the papacy too detached from the world, whereas the whole history of the Popes is a history of men of their time being liable to share in all the good and bad habits and vices of their time. The difference lies in the power of the error, which has never been so mighty as it is today, mankind never having been, as one must not forget, so degenerate as today.

“For indeed liberalism is now everywhere and it is overwhelming, no longer a mere thought, or way of thinking, but a very way of being that permeates every man alive, be he an absolute liberal in himself, or an agent of liberalism and its subversion, or merely one of its tools. Such is the case of the Conciliar Popes. They think they are drawing close to the world to heal it. They do not realize that it is the world which is drawing them to itself to infect and control them.

“In such a situation as this, one can certainly speak of liberal Popes but not of non-Catholic Popes, insofar as there is lacking the prime requisite for such a condemnation, namely the personal will on their part to be liberals and not Catholics. All one can do is recognize the fact that in these Popes there is the personal will to be Catholics and not anti-Catholic liberals, since for them there is no contradiction between the two, far from it. According to their theologian and thinker, Joseph

Ratzinger, liberalism is one of the good by-products of Catholicism, needing only to be cleansed of certain alien distortions imported into it. And so as for destroying the Church, it stands to reason that Popes believing in such a compromised Catholicism cannot help one of the consequences of their actions being the destruction of the Church.

“Concerning Archbishop Lefebvre, given that he grew up in a Church quite different from today’s Church, I can only conclude that for him it was impossible for a Catholic acting as an instrument of subversion not to realize what he was doing. Still less could a Pope not realize. From reading between the lines of certain of the Archbishop’s writings, I do believe that while his vision of the world certainly included the process of degeneration reaching down to the end of time, it did not include that process involving in any clear manner the Church as well.”

I can just hear readers objecting to this kind of analysis: “Oh, Excellency, please stop defending the Conciliar Popes. It’s black or white. If they’re black, I’ll be a happy sedevacantist. If they’re white, I’ll be a happy liberal. Your greys do nothing but confuse me!”

Dear reader, black is black, white is white, but rarely in real life do we find pure white, and never pure black (whatever is, has the goodness of being). If you want to understand this relative excusing of the Conciliar Popes, the key is to grasp that the world has never been so deeply bad as it is today. From this unprecedented degeneracy it is obvious that Conciliar Popes are in this respect more excusable for going astray in the Faith than any of their predecessors.

Kyrie eleison.

ELIOT WEEKEND

No. CDXI (411)

May 30, 2015

Catholics, do not be narrow. Our Lord said
That sheep outside his fold have him as head.

The weekend seminar held here in Broadstairs at the beginning of May on poems and plays of the famous modern poet, T.S. Eliot (1888–1965), was a great success. Eliot is a writer difficult to understand, because he insisted on making sense of the senseless modern world, but Dr David White’s six lectures (in 36 hours!) inspired in his more than two dozen Catholic listeners a real interest in Eliot. He was chosen as subject of the literary seminar because he wrote part of his most famous poem, the *Waste Land*, in nearby Margate. A high point of the seminar was an excursion to the seaside pavilion where Eliot did the actual writing, and where Dr White recited the *Waste Land* to seminar participants in front of a grey sea, beneath a grey sky – the atmospherics were perfect!

Many Catholics object to writers who are not openly Catholic, however famous they may be. But in the mid-1920’s, soon after writing the *Waste Land*, Eliot nearly became a Catholic, and from then on until his death the solution he presented in his writings for the modern world’s problems centred around Our Lord Jesus Christ. This may not be obvious at first view, either because he was writing for lukewarm Christians, or because he was still himself wrestling with modernity, but let his real belief in Christ be illustrated by a poem from his *Four Quartets*, singled out by Dr White for explanation, section IV of the fourth quartet, “Little Gidding”:—

1. The dove descending breaks the air
2. With flame of incandescent terror
3. Of which the tongues declare
4. The one discharge from sin and error.
5. The only hope, or else despair
6. Lies in the choice of pyre or pyre –
7. To be redeemed from fire by fire.

8. Who then devised the torment? Love.
9. Love is the unfamiliar Name
10. Behind the hands that wove

11. The intolerable shirt of flame
12. Which human power cannot remove.
13. We only live, only suspire
14. Consumed by either fire or fire.

During the Second World war, Eliot was living in London, and at night he acted as an Air Raid Warden, patrolling the streets to minimise the danger and damage of German air raids. The first of the poem's two verses is like those plastic double images which contain two pictures, depending on how you tilt the plastic. The second verse draws the tremendous lesson from the double image.

Thus 1) the "dove descending" is both the Holy Ghost descending at Pentecost and the enemy bombers coming down on London. 2) The "flame of terror" is both the fire of the Holy Ghost and the enemy's incendiary bombs. 3) The "tongues" are both those of the Holy Ghost on the heads of the Apostles and those of the fire-bombs, while 4) the "discharge" is both the Redemption by Christ and the releasing of the bombs by human politics. 5) The first of these is our only hope, the second is the hopelessness of war. 6) On which funeral pyre do we choose to burn? 7) The fire of Redemption is to save us from the fire of damnation.

Second verse: thus 8) it is God who designs World Wars to save us from eternal fire. 9) He is not well known, but it is 10) his Love which is allowing the politicians to cause 11) the torments of war, 12) which are redeemable by Christ alone. 13) In conclusion, human life ends only 14) in fire, either that of divine Love or that of eternal damnation.

The Third World War is coming. When it comes, how many Catholic preachers are there who will dare to preach that it is the divine Love which will have been behind its appalling sufferings, no less being necessary in order to put us back, by God's design, on track to Heaven? The non-Catholic Eliot was saying it 70 years ago.

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIAR POPES – II

No. CDXII (412)

June 6, 2015

Conciliar Popes meant well, while causing harm?
God is their judge. We wait on God's strong arm.

These "Comments" keep coming back to the problem of subjectivism because they hold that today's Church and world cannot be understood without it. Subjectivism means that rot of the mind whereby the person, or subject, has let his mind be disconnected from reality, or the object, leaving the person free to remake reality according to his own fantasy. Hence the fantasy-world in all its madness surrounding us today, including the fantasy of the Newchurch (Church and world are reconcilable) and the same fantasy of the Newsociety (Tradition and the Newchurch are reconcilable).

To keep one's mental grip on reality and to keep one's balance in the Faith, it is essential to keep distinguishing the subjective from the objective. For instance, the Conciliar Popes are gravely mistaken in the Faith, objectively speaking, but subjectively speaking they have been convinced they were right, and they may well have been at least partly (God knows) well-intentioned. But if I fail to distinguish objective and subjective, then I easily fall into one of two familiar errors. Either I say they are objectively wrong so they must be subjectively wrong, therefore they cannot have been well-intentioned and they must have known what they were doing, so they cannot have been Popes, and I fall into dogmatic sedevacantism. Or I say they are convinced and they are convincing, so they are subjectively and therefore must be objectively right, so I must follow them, and I fall into liberalism (here is how Benedict XVI, for instance, has – objectively – deceived many a good Catholic, whatever were his intentions).

On the contrary if I have a clear faith and can distinguish between objective reality and today's universal fantasy, then, measuring ultimately Rome by the Faith and not the Faith by Rome, I can see that the Conciliar Popes may have been convinced and they may at least in part – God knows – have meant well, but I will never follow them away from the true Faith and the true Church. On the other hand I will not exclude

the possibility of a measure of good intentions on their part, nor will I take upon myself to judge of that measure, but I will wait for the Church to judge, after a hearing, of their pertinacity and heresy.

But today's churchmen are so universally infected with the fantasy of liberty, equality and the rights of man as opposed to duty, hierarchy and the rights of God, that the prospects of such a hearing taking place any time soon are slim indeed. Therefore in my own mind I may have to leave in suspense the question of these Popes. Such suspense is not comfortable, but I know that God in his own good time will come to the rescue of his Papacy.

Meanwhile the structure of his Church, whereby all authority derives from the Pope downwards, has not changed. Therefore since Pope Francis is condemning Tradition whenever he gets a chance, Tradition can only be struggling to survive. As for Archbishop Lefebvre's founding and on-going leadership of the Society of St Pius X, the local diocesan bishop's official approval of its Statutes was of immense importance. That made of the SSPX the emergency lighting of the mainstream Church, and the "Resistance" movement can only be an attempt to repair that emergency lighting of the mainstream Church. The attempt is hindered by both mainstream and emergency electricians? So be it. But somebody has to keep at least a few lights on in the Church. However, against such hindrance from fellow electricians, let nobody expect from the "Resistance" wonders or marvels. Patience. God has everything under control.

Kyrie eleison.

N.B. I should be Confirming this summer: (in France) near Pau June 7, near Vichy June 14; (in Canada) Calgary June 29; and (in the USA) Denver July 1, Nashville July 2, Jacksonville July 5.

DAILY GRIND

No. CDXIII (413)

June 13, 2015

Have old means ceased to work, or do they call
For new force being put behind them all?

Not a few e-mails that cross my electronic desk are worth sharing with readers of these “Comments.” Let me quote here from two (abbreviated and adapted as usual). The first is by a young layman, a former seminarian from Winona and now the father of a large family. He is one Catholic that could never be accused of underestimating the power of today’s universal apostasy, although he is resolute that something still can, and therefore must, be done. He writes:—

“Today’s institutionalised liberalism and the modern crowd’s deafening call for Barabbas may very well result in a crop of martyrs. I can appreciate where you are coming from when you wonder whether God still wants today a traditional institution like a seminary, and so on. In the 19th century Don Bosco had to invent a new kind of lay ‘co-operator’ for his work with boys, neither a Confraternity nor a Third Order, because he said that the devil had changed his tactics, so he had had to do so as well. Good Catholics were taken by surprise, but his new adaptation of old means proved successful.

“I mention this because to keep the Faith today is like walking against the wildest rapids. Keeping all my family and myself on track for Heaven takes all that I am and all that I have. To adapt words of St Paul (II Cor. 11, 28–29), “Which of them is weak, and I am not weak?” I remember your telling us seminarians years ago that wherever we found ourselves later, we would have to bring order into flying chaos. That chaos is more intense now than it was 25 years ago, because daily life has greatly changed over the last 15, 30, 45 years. The world is now eating souls for lunch in a sophisticated and relentless way. Parents must adapt tried and true principles to meet the Devil’s new tactics, because what worked before won’t necessarily work today. It is these ‘slings and arrows’ of parenting today that make me wonder whether the need for different means to achieve the same ends might not apply to seminaries and vocations also.”

The second email comes from a “Resistance” priest who says that the old means are still good, but they do need to be faithfully applied. He writes:—

“It is incredible how many of our people are not doing the basic things of Catholic life. They want to be pleasing to God. Now special Catholic initiatives and undertakings are not bad in themselves, but they are far less important, difficult and meritorious than the daily grind. Our people want to avoid mortal sin, and that’s about it. How many times do I hear they “forgot” to say their morning/evening prayers, or those before/after meals. And the reading of the Bible, lives of the saints, catechism! This is why I work, in season and out of season, to try to convince my people to have a steady and regular Catholic life, to convince them that this is what is truly pleasing to God.

“The same applies to the ‘Resistance.’ I have told my people that the real test will be that of keeping going, of perseverance. It was relatively easy, two to three years ago, when we were in a pitched battle, hacking to left and to right, but now it is more like trench warfare. And we will hold our ground as a movement if every priest and Catholic layman holds his ground in his daily life.”

God created no soul for Hell (I Tim. II, 4). It follows that every soul can find the means to get to Heaven, if it wants. These means may be difficult, but they will not be complicated, otherwise they would be inaccessible to many. The old-fashioned means, especially the daily Rosary, are not complicated, but they do need to be applied.

Kyrie eleison.

FATIMA REVERSED?

No. CDXIV (414)

June 20, 2015

Is Russia's Consecration out of date?
It's indispensable, however late.

When on June 13, 1929, Our Lady of Fatima appeared to Sister Lucy at Tuy in Spain to ask for the Consecration of Russia to her Immaculate Heart, it made perfect sense, because ever since the Russian Revolution broke out in October, 1917, Russia had been persecuting the Church and acting as the main instrument of Communism to spread its deadly errors throughout the world. However, Russia is now playing such a different part on the stage of world affairs that a number of Catholics are wondering if that Consecration is still needed. Has it not been overtaken by events?

True, with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 the Russian people began to repudiate the godless Communism under which they had suffered so much for 70 years, and since then they have not ceased to evolve towards God instead of away from him. Leading this evolution has been Russia's Prime Minister or President since 1999, Vladimir Putin (born in 1952), who by his personal example and public leadership has done all he could to promote the real revival of the Christian Orthodox religion within Russia. Some observers still doubt that Putin is genuine, but the fruits are there: thousands of churches and cathedrals rebuilt all over Russia and morality defended, while outside of Russia Putin has more than once delayed the outbreak of World War III by outwitting the delinquent Western politicians, puppets of the godless New World Order and pushing for its triumph.

Then can one say that Russia today no longer needs to be converted? No, because Orthodox Christianity is not yet Catholicism, and because Communism has reportedly left its mark on the morals of the Russian people, for instance in the still widespread practice of abortion. But what one can surely say is that by the present religious revival, witnessed for many a year now by Western visitors to Russia, Our Lady is preparing for the full conversion of Russia, and while that full conversion may no longer be needed to put an end to Russian Communism, in the 21st century it may be even more needed to overcome world Globalism. Let us speculate on how that

might happen.

To break out of the aggressive encirclement of Russia by military bases of a nameless western power which has let itself be instrumentalised by the evil Masters of Globalism, Russia, the apparent but not the real aggressor (the two are not always the same), invades and conquers Europe thoroughly corrupted by atheistic materialism. Under the pressure of war and occupation, the Pope at last performs the Consecration of Russia, as requested by Our Lady at Fatima, and the miraculous full conversion begins to take place, but not to the putrid religion of Conciliar Rome, rather to a brand-new (and brand-old) Catholicism (Mt.XIII, 52), in which all the Truth of Eternal Rome and of the once faithful West is revitalised by the religious freshness of the post-Communist Russians drawing on everything truest and best in their own Eastern traditions.

Wishful thinking? The details here stitched together from prophecies, and even the grand lines of the speculation can be wrong, but in any case some such miracle will be wrought by Our Lady to cleanse the East of its errors and the West of its corruption, so that the Church can again breathe with both lungs, and so that there can come about that “period of peace for the world” which she promised at Fatima. In any case believers will be crying out with St Paul, “O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!” (Rom. XI, 33). If we are among the survivors, we shall be marvelling at the works of God and of his Blessed Mother.

Kyrie eleison.

ARGUING AWRY

No. CDXV (415)

June 27, 2015

Should Menzingen ask Rome for recognition?
No! How can apostates grant such a petition?

In the latest issue of the Society of St Pius X's internal publication (mainly for Society priests), "Cor Unum," the Superior General publishes arguments to defend and justify his relentless pursuit of the SSPX's incorporation into the mainstream Church. He argues that the Society is right to be talking to today's Roman officials. He presents basically two arguments. These need to be examined if they are not to continue creating confusion.

The first of the two arguments runs as follows: The Catholic Church, as the Immaculate Bride of Christ, is much more than just its corrupt officials, because it is a whole of which these officials are merely a part. But the Catholic Society of St Pius X must remain in contact with the Catholic Church. Therefore it must maintain contact, and continue to negotiate, with the corrupt officials.

The argument is easy to refute, as soon as one brings into view the Faith. Indeed Catholics must draw from the Immaculate Bride of Christ whatever they need to get to Heaven, but it is never from the corruption of the corrupt Church officials that they will be able to draw their spiritual life. And if these officials are so corrupt in the Faith that contact with them positively endangers that faith of Catholics which is the very basis of Catholics' spiritual life, then Catholics must positively avoid such officials. Now the neo-modernism of today's Roman officials is highly corrupt and corrupting, all the more objectively dangerous for its being more or less, on their part, subjectively innocent. Therefore Catholics wishing to keep the faith must stay well away from these Romans. "Cor Unum" argues as though neo-modernists present no danger to the Faith!

Archbishop Lefebvre drew the correct conclusion. When in the spring of 1988 he did everything he could have done (even, one may say, more than he should have done) to get the Roman officials to do their duty to look after Catholic Tradition, and even after over 10 years of the Archbishop's efforts, they still refused, showing that, far

from wanting to look after Tradition, they merely wanted to absorb it into their Newchurch, then the Archbishop concluded that they were so corrupt in the Faith that he would have nothing more to do with them until they professed once more the Faith of the great anti-liberal papal documents, such as the Syllabus, Pascendi, and Quas Primas.

For indeed the Faith does not exist for the appointed Church officials, but they exist for the Faith. So if their fruits demonstrate beyond any doubt that they are destroying the Faith, then, to defend the Faith, not only should the Society not be talking to the Conciliar officials, it should, while observing all charity and respect, be fleeing them like the plague, for fear of itself being infected by their dangerously infectious Conciliar errors, unless and until, exactly as Archbishop Lefebvre said, they show that they are quitting their Conciliarism and coming back to true Catholic doctrine.

The second argument is that Rome's granting of bishops to visit the Society's seminaries (including Écône) is proof of Rome's "benevolence" towards the Society, because Rome is "at a loss how to deal with the Society." And once more a swallow here and there is taken to be signifying the summer of Rome's conversion. The naivete is breathtaking. Rome knows exactly how to deal with the Society: send Conciliar bishops into Society seminaries to show its future priests how nice the Conciliar churchmen are. Then eventually the Society will just flow into the Newchurch.

The SSPX has no business to be asking for anything whatsoever from these Roman officials, appointees perhaps, apostates certainly. And if it gives them to think that, objectively and collectively, they are anything other than apostates, it will be "like to them, a liar" (cf. Jn. VIII, 55).

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIAR POPES – III

No. CDXVI (416)

July 4, 2015

The Church officials' minds no longer work?
Measures extreme God may not have to shirk.

Readers of these “Comments,” “Conciliar Popes I” and “II” of six and four weeks ago respectively, may well have carried away the impression that the “Comments” hold that Pope Francis “may be inculpable for his ignorance of his blasphemies and heresies,” as one reader put it. That is a mistaken impression. While today’s universal liberalism may excuse “partly” and “relatively” the Conciliar Popes’ destruction of the Catholic Church, it certainly does not excuse it completely. Their culpability, at least partial, is common sense, and proof of it is not difficult to follow.

The Catholic Church belongs to God. He founded it and he designed it to function with human beings as his instruments. These human officials of his Church he will never allow completely to destroy it, but nor will he take away their free-will, with the result that each of them can greatly merit or demerit by the way in which he uses or abuses his office. However, upon that use or abuse depends the salvation of many other souls besides his own. How then can one imagine God not offering to these officials all the grace they need to fulfil their official duties for the good of souls? If then the Conciliar Popes, Cardinals and Bishops are all truly appointed Church officials, as they appear to be and as few deny who are not sedevacantists, then they are receiving from God grace sufficient to run the Church well. If then, broadly speaking, they are running it into the ground, they must be refusing graces of state, graces of their office. And if they are refusing the grace of God in the fulfilment of their duty, they cannot be wholly blameless. They may not be to blame for the mushy world around them, but God’s grace would ultimately lead their minds out of the mush, if they wanted. They do not want, because then they would have to confront that mushy world.

Let us imagine a concrete example which must have happened in real life in the 1970’s many times. A little old grandmother manages to approach the Holy Father. In a flood of tears she explains that her grandson was a good boy when he entered the

(Conciliar) seminary, but there he lost not only his vocation but also his faith and even his virtue. If, as is most likely, the Conciliar Pope relies on officials around him to brush her off, he is not innocent, because little old grandmothers can be unmistakably genuine. But these Popes prefer their Conciliar dream, in harmony with the world.

And here is a real example from Brazil, probably in the 1980's. John-Paul II was holding a meeting of diocesan bishops to discuss the apostolate in their dioceses. At a given moment a young bishop stood up to say that the flock in his diocese was being ravaged by ecumenism's promoting the invasion of Protestant sects from the USA, a familiar disaster for many years now throughout Latin America. The Pope listened to the bishop's testimony, but within a short time he was back to promoting exactly that ecumenism which the bishop had just denounced. When confronted with the Catholic reality, the Pope preferred his Conciliar dream. How could he be completely innocent?

It would follow that these Popes are neither wholly innocent nor wholly guilty of the Church's present devastation. How much are they the one, how much the other? God alone knows. But if a good Pope was appointed, and protected by God, to sift the Church officials, clean out the bad ones and promote the good ones, he would appoint a tribunal or inquisition – yes, inquisition – to force each official to choose openly between Truth or mush. Would it be an easy task? No, because mush-merchants have no difficulty in pretending that they love truth, and they can easily believe themselves that they deal only in truth. They can fit their minds to anything, and to the opposite of anything. Then what can be done? A Chastisement, to clean out the Augean stables.

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIAR POPES – IV

No. CDXVII (417)

July 11, 2015

Of “mind-rot” did the Archbishop never speak?
With other words he too said minds are weak.

Many readers of these “Comments” presently find they are treating too often of sedevacantism, or of the position that the See of Rome is vacant, i.e. no Pope since Vatican II has been a real Pope. Now if a Catholic needs to hold that opinion in order not to lose his Catholic faith, let him hold it, because his faith is paramount (Heb. XI, 6). But the opinion in itself is dangerous precisely because it can be the beginning of a slide towards losing the faith, and that is why these “Comments” are so insistent on discouraging sedevacantism. From an opinion it becomes all too easily a dogma, then the super-dogma and the measure of whether one is Catholic or not, from where it can slide into complete disbelief in the structural Church and into “home-aloning,” even to loss of one’s Catholic faith. Consider what Archbishop Lefebvre said (slightly adapted, and with emphasis added) in late 1979 in a conference to Écône seminarians:—

“We must be prudent. It is obvious that if Pope Paul VI was not Pope, then the Cardinals he appointed are not Cardinals, so they cannot have elected John-Paul I, and they cannot have validly elected John-Paul II, that much is clear. I don’t think one can say such things. I think these are exaggerations, arguing in a manner too absolute and too rapid. I think the reality is more complex.

“I think that those who argue like this are in a certain way forgetting moral theology and ethics. They are being too speculative. Moral theology and ethics teach us to reason and to judge of people and their acts according to a whole context of circumstances which we must take into account: “Who, what, where, by what means, why, how, when” – all seven circumstances must be examined if we are to judge of the morality of an act. So we cannot remain in the pure stratosphere, one might say, in the realm of pure dogmatic theology, by pronouncing, for instance, that such an act is heretical, therefore whoever did it is a heretic. But was this person aware of what he was doing, did he do it truly by himself, was he not deceived or forced into doing it?

“I think that here is how to solve the grave problems posed by John XXIII, Paul VI and John-Paul I. The latter is quoted in the newspapers as having said that he had thought at first that the Council’s new definition of religious liberty was unacceptable because the Church taught the opposite, but on further study of the Council document and all its contents he had realized that the Church was mistaken beforehand. Now I have no idea what were John-Paul I’s exact words, but to say that the Church could be mistaken on such a matter as religious liberty just boggles the mind! However, I put it down to liberal minds. Liberalism is like that. Liberalism both makes a statement and then contradicts it, and if one shows that what it said is not true, then it comes up with another ambiguous formula with a double meaning. The liberal mind is continually floating around, with expressions that are not clear, with things that can be taken two ways How many things there are like that in the Council, expressions equivocal and unclear, altogether typical of minds adrift, liberal minds As I see it, I think that the fact that the Pope is a liberal is enough to explain the situation in which we find ourselves.”

Bravo, your Excellency! Is not the Archbishop saying here exactly what these “Comments” have so often been saying? And the reason why these “Comments” have been saying it so often is because they see here the key to avoiding liberalism without having to resort to sedevacantism.

Kyrie eleison.

CONCILIAR POPES – V

No. CDXVIII (418)

July 18, 2015

God will at last rescue his Church, of course,
But Catholics must cry out, till they are hoarse.

Last week's "Comments" went so far as to suggest that to get a handle on the liberal mentality is a good way to keep the Faith today. Seeing how liberalism dissolves the Truth, one understands how it is undermining the Faith and destroying the Church. At the same time seeing how it corrupts minds, one understands how today's churchmen are "diabolically disoriented" without necessarily being fully aware of how they are destroying the Church. Thus one need be neither liberal nor sedevacantist. So let us look at another classic text of Archbishop Lefebvre where he examines "The Catholic Liberal Mentality" in Chapter XVI of *They Have Uncrowned Him*:—

"A sickness of the mind. 'Rather than a confusion of mind, liberal Catholicism is a sickness of the mind' (Fr. A. Roussel in his book *Liberalism and Catholicism*): the mind is unable simply to rest in the truth. It can venture no statement without thinking immediately of the counter-statement, which it feels equally obliged to make. Pope Paul VI was a classic example of such a split mind, of a two-faced being – it could even be read physically on his features – perpetually tossed between two contradictory positions and driven by a balancing movement, swinging regularly between Tradition and novelty – would some people call it intellectual schizophrenia?

"I think that Fr Clérissac saw deepest into the nature of this sickness. It is 'a lack of integrity of the mind' (*Mystery of the Church*, Chapter VII). It is a mind 'lacking trust in the truth When liberalism prevails, this lack of integrity in the mind shows psychologically in two clear characteristics: liberals are malleable and anxious: malleable, because they too easily take on the state of mind of those around them; anxious, because for fear of clashing with different states of mind they are continually concerned to justify themselves; they seem to suffer themselves from the doubts they are fighting against; they do not have enough confidence in the truth; they are too concerned to be justifying their position, demonstrating or adapting or even apologizing.'

“Too concerned to be in harmony with the world, to be apologizing! That is so well said: they want to apologize for the whole past of the Church, the Crusades, the Inquisition, and so on. When it comes to justifying and demonstrating, they go about it very timidly, especially when the rights of Jesus Christ are involved, but when it comes to adapting to the world, they go at it, that is their basic principle. They start out from what they consider to be a practical principle, for them an undeniable fact, namely that the Church cannot be understood in the actual surroundings where it has to fulfil its divine mission without its getting in harmony with them.”

Since the time of Fr Clérissac and of Archbishop Lefebvre, the dissolution of minds and hearts by liberalism has only made great advances. In the 21st century, there are even fewer traces left of yesteryear’s framework of objective truth and objective morality than there were in the 20th century. This being so, for the Church to adapt to its surroundings becomes more and more deadly for Catholic Faith and morals, which are nothing if not objective. How we have had to suffer from a mind continually alternating statements with counter-statements, continually anxious to win over both of two parties completely opposed to one another, to reconcile irreconcilables, lacking not only confidence in the truth but even, as it seems, any knowledge of the truth, were it not that this mind can do such a good imitation of the truth. Such a mind used to be said to belong to a “liar.” Today?

We can only cry out, like the Psalmist: Lord, your own Catholics have become a mockery to non-Catholics. For your own honour and glory, hasten to our rescue!

Kyrie eleison.

TRUST PLEADS

No. CDXIX (419)

July 25, 2015

Over the Church now madness seems to reign.
The Psalmist's trust we need, amidst our pain.

When in modern times the world began to turn its back on God, did it really think that he would not notice or that he would not care? Today's madness is reaching a climax in which more and more souls must be realizing that for him to step in has become an absolute necessity, and that it will be a great act of mercy. However, in order not to lose heart in the meantime, let us see how even in Old Testament times the Psalmist urged God to step in, without doubting for a moment in his power to do so. The Psalms are a divinely inspired school of prayer for all time, and they apply just as much to the New Testament as to the Old. Here is Psalm 73 (74, modern numbering):—

A. THE ANXIETY [1] O God, why hast thou cast us off unto the end: why is thy wrath enkindled against the sheep of thy pasture? [2] Remember thy congregation (Catholics) which thou hast possessed from the beginning. The sceptre of thy inheritance which thou hast redeemed: Mount Sion (the Catholic Church) in which thou hast dwelt. [3] Lift up thy hands against their pride unto the end; see what things the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary (e.g. of the Novus Ordo). [4] And they that hate thee have made their boasts, in the midst of thy solemnity (e.g. liturgy). They have set up their ensigns for signs, [5] And they knew not (God) both in the going out and on the highest top. As with axes in a wood of trees, [6] they have cut down at once the gates of thy solemnity, with axe and hatchet they have brought it down. [7] They have set fire to thy sanctuary: they have defiled the dwelling place of thy name on the earth. [8] They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us abolish all the festival days of God (Catholic Feast-days) from the land. [9] Our signs we have not seen, there is now no prophet: and God will know us no more. [10] How long, O God, shall the enemy reproach: is the adversary to provoke thy name for ever? [11] Why dost thou turn away thy hand: and thy right hand out of the midst of thy bosom for ever?

B. THE TRUST [12] But God is our king before ages: he hath wrought salvation in the midst of the earth. [13] Thou by thy strength didst make the sea firm: thou didst crush the heads of the dragons in the waters. [14] Thou hast broken the heads of the dragon: thou hast given him to be meat for the people of the Ethiopians. [15] Thou hast broken up the fountains and the torrents: thou hast dried up the Ethan rivers. [16] Thine is the day, and thine is the night: thou hast made the dawn and the sun. [17] Thou hast made all the borders of the earth: the summer and the spring were formed by thee.

C. THE PLEA [18] Remember this, the enemy hath reproached the Lord: and a foolish people hath provoked thy name. [19] Deliver not up to beasts the souls that confess to thee (Catholics keeping the Faith): and forget not to the end the souls of thy poor. [20] Have regard to thy covenant (the Catholic Church): for they that are the obscure of the earth (humble Catholics) have been filled with dwellings of iniquity (e.g the New World Order). [21] Let not the humble be turned away with confusion: the poor and needy shall praise thy name. [22] Arise, O God, judge thy own cause: remember thy reproaches with which the foolish man hath reproached thee all day long. [23] Forget not the voices of thy enemies: the pride of them that hate thee is continually rising.

Kyrie eleison.

AUTHORITY LIMPING

No. CDXX (420)

August 1, 2015

The Shepherd is struck, the sheep are all dispersed.
Authority is upside down, reversed.

Good souls regularly wish me to “step up to the plate” and assume a position of authority at the head of today’s “Resistance” movement. Let me propose, without imposing, the reasons for my serious reluctance to attempt any such thing.

Authority in the Church is “shot,” from the top downwards. The present Pope (I am no sedevacantist) is out of his Catholic mind, if ever he had one. But even if his election as Pope was invalid for one reason or another, it was convalidated by his virtually universal acceptance as Pope throughout the worldwide Church. In any case nobody else is Pope, or can be, and therefore he has the supreme authority in the Church. Now the Church was so designed by Our Lord as to be a monarchy, with all authority descending in it through the Pope from God. For by definition authority can only come from above. As Jefferson says in the United States’ Declaration of Independence, authority given from below can always be taken back from below. Authority from below is in fact a contradiction in terms. It is no real authority at all.

Therefore unless this Pope were to give me authority to lead the “Resistance,” which is obviously inconceivable, I will never have official Catholic authority to head up the resisters. Can I have supplied authority due to the emergency? In theory, yes, but supplied authority is relatively weak. It is supplied from above (by the Church) when for instance a penitent asks a priest in unusual circumstances to hear his confession, i.e. when normally the priest would have no jurisdiction to do so. So supplied authority descends from the Church above, but it is triggered only by the demand from below. No demand, no supplied authority.

Take Archbishop Lefebvre’s own case. Firstly, it was very important to him that the Statutes of the original SSPX were officially approved by the diocesan bishop of Geneva, Lausanne and Fribourg. Secondly, for instance, if a priest of the SSPX wanted to quit the SSPX, to right or to left, the Archbishop had no power to stop him or to punish him except by having nothing more to do with him. And if that priest

departed towards the Novus Ordo Church, he was often greeted, as one can imagine, with open arms. The SSPX under Bishop Fellay has more and more wanted to be normal and has pretended it is normal, but actually it is a weak structure insofar as it has never had any jurisdiction more than supplied (this is one reason why Bishop Fellay so wants to be re-integrated into the mainstream Church).

Now that was the Archbishop! And I am no Archbishop Lefebvre. Therefore a certain number of good souls can turn to me for guidance, as they do, but it is not in me to claim even a supplied jurisdiction, because of the enormous confusion reigning in the Church. At present I am more and more disinclined to impose even a true viewpoint on anybody, because souls are now so confused that the least imposition is liable to increase rather than decrease that confusion. "I WILL STRIKE THE SHEPHERD AND THE SHEEP WILL BE SCATTERED" (Zachary XIII, 7), quoted by Our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt. XXVI, 31), and that is how it is going to be in the Church, more and more, until God in his mercy restores the Shepherd, which he will do only when mankind will appreciate a true Shepherd of God. Until then God's gift of such a Shepherd would risk doing more harm than good. So in the meantime we must all take our just punishment: the universal confusion!

That is why I will give to anybody who asks me my reasons for acting as I do, but I will propose those reasons rather than impose them, and I will not usually object to people disagreeing with me.

Kyrie eleison.

FOOD, WATER

No. CDXXI (421)

August 8, 2015

Without God man lives badly, and not well.
His “civilisation” soon will crash to Hell.

I hate to be a prophet of doom, but what a retired US Government employee with numerous national awards for his services sees coming, and wrote to me, must be told, because I am sure it is the truth.

“The West is hurtling to destruction as it continues to abandon God and His Holy Apostolic Church. My family and I live in a Novus Ordo wasteland. We attend Mass at an SSPX chapel, but we are watching and praying, because the SSPX appears to be reconciled to its absorption and destruction by the modernists. The solution to the problem is the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Our Mother. But right now the Pope has no interest in doing it, nor does the Curia. Our Lord has informed us that the Consecration will be done, but it will be late. I believe this may mean after the beginning of the Chastisement, which will be unlike anything imaginable.

“I stay abreast of the news concerning the world economy, or should I say, the central banking Ponzi scheme. It cannot go on for ever. Debt is neither currency, nor money, nor wealth. It is slavery, a noose to be placed around the common people’s neck for the control of their labor and wealth. I believe an economic collapse will occur within a couple of years. It will be like the tulip bulb crash in 1637 in Holland when people realized that tulip bulbs really were just that, and not gold. Every world power is printing as much unbacked fiat currency as it can, and is lying about its economic figures. All economies will crash like an avalanche and be wiped out.

“Modern man having become a creature of extreme comfort and extreme ingratitude, one can only imagine how people will react when there is no more free stuff, Internet, television, cell phones, or food stamps on demand. It will be chaos. The powers that be are conditioning people for this moment by creating scapegoats. This has been done many times before, to justify the poor or destructive decisions by the criminal elite, and to provide cover for those that truly caused the trouble, notably those

exposed by Father Denis Fahey.

“The US Government expects staggering life loss as a result of the collapse, and yet does nothing. Evil will be unleashed as people realize the incredible breadth and depth of the crisis, and turn their cities into unspeakable zones of violence and depravity. The population without God and morals will be hell-bent on personal survival. In an instant the modern world will be stopped in its tracks. Man will be faced with the stark reality of his weakness, his utter lack of control, his true dependence on God.

“Your Excellency, people are at a point that they can do anything with a cell-phone, but are unable to grow a potato, hammer a nail, or perform rudimentary plumbing. When the Ponzi scheme collapses, only skilled trades and the true priesthood will have any value. Carpentry, Plumbing, Electrical, Water Management, Waste Management, mechanics, farming, animal husbandry (not factory farms), that’s about it. Young Catholic men should be encouraged to enter these trades and then to create a new Guild system. Today’s corrupt universities, presently propped up by the debt market, will be clearly worthless. The truth is needed now more than ever. Traditional Catholics must be told to embrace traditional skills, traditional roles, and traditional lives. Indeed we must abandon the Bing-Crosby-Sunday-Mass-Only-Catholicism, but we must also embrace the daily work necessary to restore Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary as Our King and Queen in our daily lives. The faithful must be advised to prepare for the safety of their families and others in need. This involves the securing of food and water, because most supermarkets only contain a 36-hour supply of goods for the local population.”

Kyrie eleison.

ENTERTAINER'S ALCHEMY

No. CDXXII (422)

August 15, 2015

To think that two and two are four,
 And neither five nor three,
 The heart of man has long been sore,
 And long 'tis like to be.
 —A.E. Housman (1859–1936)

A reader of these “Comments” forwarded to me in May a video-clip from the Internet (to be found [here](#)) which she said was then circulating widely on Facebook and was having “a massive influence on people.” The clip presents a well-known black American entertainer, Will Smith, being interviewed on “Progressive Thought Patterns,” which is a pompous title for a pile of nonsense. But then who ever resorted to Facebook or to icons of entertainment to hear sense? The interest lies for Catholics in seeing how the exact same Kantian nonsense that has overwhelmed the Church (see Pascendi, as the key to Vatican II) is also fermenting at street level amongst ordinary people without the least knowledge of Kant or of Pascendi. Here is what Will Smith says to his interviewer (with a few comments inserted in italics):—

“I don’t wanna’ (want to) be an icon (which he certainly is, as having been highly successful in Hollywood), I wanna’ be an idea. You know, I wanna’ represent an idea. I wanna’ represent possibilities. I wanna’ represent magic, right, that you’re in a universe, and two plus two equals four. Two plus two equals four only if you accept that two plus two equals four. Two plus two is gonna’ be what I want it to be, you know, and there’s a redemptive (note that word – so what is Redemption?) power that making a choice has, you know, like feeling you’re an effect (perhaps he means “cause”) to all things that are happening. Make a choice, like you just decide what is gonna’ be, who you’re gonna’ be, how you’re gonna’ do it. Just decide, and then from that point the universe is gonna’ get outa’ your way. It’s water, it wants to move and go around, and stuff, you know, so for me I wanna’ represent possibilities. I wanna represent the idea that you really can make what you want.

“One of my favourite books is *The Alchemist* by Paul Coelho, and I just believe that. I believe that I can create whatever I wanna’ create. If I can put my head to it, study it

and learn the patterns (. . .), I feel very strongly that we are who we choose to be. I consider myself an alchemist. An alchemist is basically a mystical chemist, right, and one of the great feats that alchemists used to do is that they would take lead, take a chunk of lead, and make it turn from lead into gold. So I connect it (my idea, presumably) symbolically to being able to turn lead into gold. My grandmother used to say, ‘Life give you a lemon, you go ahead and make lemonade’ (that of course is good old-fashioned common sense, two generations back. But for Will Smith –) To me that’s alchemy. That’s the same concept behind *The Alchemist*.”

All the above is a close reproduction of Will Smith’s own words, not in order to make fun of him, but in order to show Kant at work amongst ordinary people who are far from being readers of Kant.

Notice that Will Smith is not completely devoid of common sense. If the word “alchemy” really means making lemonade out of lemons, then it respects reality. But if the word stands for making gold out of lead, as it often does, then it stands for a dream which has been dreamt down the ages and represents escaping from reality, or, worse, the refusal of natural reality and even a resorting to devils for a preternatural bending of it.

Now Will Smith is an entertainer, and his video-clip is quite entertaining, so nothing obliges us to take too seriously anything he says. But just recently a professional mathematician, one who is at the top of his profession, told me what scorn for objective reality he observes amongst his colleagues. The real problem goes way beyond mere entertainment.

Kyrie eleison.

CONTRADICTORY ROMANS?

No. CDXXIII (423)

August 22, 2015

No doctrine? Then apostasy will win.
Doctrine must be maintained, through thick or thin.

Two Roman churchmen have seemed to contradict one another in remarks made recently about relations between Rome and the Society of St Pius X, but one explanation of the contradiction may be that Rome is playing on the Society a police trick as old as the hills. By the “good cop, bad cop” routine, when the police want to get a confession out of a criminal, firstly a brutal policeman is sent in to beat up the criminal until he is in a very sorry condition, requiring all kinds of sympathy. Then a really nice policeman is sent in, oozing with a sympathy which often makes the criminal open up and confess his crime.

The “bad cop” in this case would be no less than the Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Müller, who early this month in an interview with katholisch.de, official website of the German Bishops’ Conference, said about a Rome-SSPX agreement that “There is no substantial new development. The Holy Father wishes that we keep trying: “con tenacia e pazienza” – “with tenacity and patience.” The precondition for a full reconciliation is the signing of a doctrinal preamble in order to guarantee a full agreement in the essential questions of the Faith. In the past months, there were encounters of different ways which are meant to strengthen the mutual trust.”

Here it is clearly stated that the SSPX will have to sign a doctrinal text agreeable to neo-modernist Rome if it wishes for an agreement with Rome. The Cardinal is also being a “bad cop” when he reveals that there were “encounters of different ways” between Romans and the SSPX “to strengthen mutual trust.” Or is the SSPX happy that Rome is shedding the light of day upon contacts otherwise unknown? Yet who that has the Catholic faith is re-assured by mutual trust being established with neo-modernists? But now comes the “good cop.”

Earlier this year Bishop Athanasius Schneider visited two seminaries of the SSPX “in order to conduct a discussion on a specific theological topic with a group of

theologians of the SSPX and with His Excellency Bishop Fellay.” Just recently he conducted an interview with a Hispanic website, [Rorate Caeli en español](#), in which among other things he commented favourably on these visits. He himself was treated with cordial respect, and he observed a respect all around for the reigning Pontiff, Pope Francis. After his visits he could see “no weighty reasons to deny the clergy and faithful of the SSPX the official canonical recognition, and meanwhile they should be accepted as they are.” Bishop Schneider confirmed that he saw no doctrinal problem in the way of an agreement by downplaying the importance of Vatican II: the Council was primarily pastoral, and of its time, he said.

So who represents the real Rome? Cardinal Müller or Bishop Schneider? Certainly both. If the “good cop, bad cop” routine is not conscious, it is certainly instinctive. Rome, by keeping its options open, can continue to play the SSPX like a fish, reeling it in, letting it out, raising hopes and then dashing them, bending the wire and straightening it out again, and again, until finally it snaps. Alas, one may suspect that by “encounters” the leaders of the SSPX are complicit in this game of Rome.

Kyrie eleison.

RELENTLESS ROMANS

No. CDXXIV (424)

August 29, 2015

Readers, wait for it, take in advance a hint –
When the agreement comes, read the fine print!

Rumours coming from the Society of St Pius X seem to confirm the speculation of these “Comments” last week (see EC 423 of Aug. 22) that Rome wants an agreement with the SSPX. The rumours tell of a secret meeting held at the beginning of this month where SSPX leaders discussed finances and a “doctrinal preamble.” Was it the same preamble mentioned by Cardinal Müller on August 3? Drawn up by Rome for the SSPX to sign? The Cardinal said that that would be necessary for any agreement, while Bishop Schneider saw no doctrinal problem because Vatican II was merely “pastoral.” With or without rumours, let us review unchanging basics.

The 16 official documents of the Second Vatican Council present together a new vision of God, life and man, a new religion in tune with the man-centred modern world, but clashing with the God-centred Catholic religion that had not changed essentially for over 1900 years. Both religions teach their vision of God, life and man, both are doctrinal, but the two doctrines clash. However, by skilful ambiguities – ambiguity is the hallmark of the 16 documents – the Council Fathers were persuaded that there was no clash, and so when they voted in favour of the documents, there were three reasons why Catholics worldwide went along with the new religion: its clash with the true Faith was skilfully disguised, it was imposed on Catholics by almost all Church authorities from the Popes downwards, and it was rather easier to practise than the pre-Conciliar religion.

But God raised one true shepherd, Archbishop Lefebvre, to insist on the doctrinal clash, to stand up to the unfaithful Church authorities, and to continue the practice of the pre-Conciliar religion for any souls wishing to take the trouble. And these were enough in number for the Archbishop’s Society to have spread all over the world by the time he died in 1991. But his successors at the head of his Society were born after World War II into a very different world from that of the Archbishop, born before World War I. They did not see the world or doctrine as he saw them, so they had not

the same motivation as he had to go on standing up to the Church authorities, even if they were not yet themselves wanting the Conciliar relaxation of Church discipline (wanted now by more and more Traditionalists). It was simply a matter of time before the magnetism of Rome would exert its pull.

As for the Romans, they were obdurate in their new Conciliar religion, and so from 2000 onwards they openly welcomed all approaches being made by the SSPX, because its doctrine and practice of unchanged Catholicism were a standing rebuke to their Freemasonic novelties, and a constant threat to them, like an unconquered pocket of the enemy in the rear of an otherwise all-successful invasion. Therefore as the Romans want to absorb the SSPX into their Newchurch, so the SSPX's present leaders want to put themselves back under Rome's official Church authority. It is a marriage made in Hell, and sweet Newchurchmen like Bishop Schneider can see no problem, because they have not seen, or have not wanted to see, the underlying clash of basic doctrine.

So Cardinal Müller is right in this respect. If two men have different visions of God, life and man, any agreement between them can only be relatively superficial. So if the SSPX cannot be brought by Rome to abandon dogma, or rather to undermine all Catholic dogma with the Masonic super-dogma that all dogma is mush, then the SSPX is bound to act within the walls of Rome like a Trojan horse. That is why the Cardinal will insist on a preamble, whether written by Rome or by the SSPX is of no importance, so long as the mass of Traditionalists, just like the mass of Catholics after Vatican II, will let themselves be deceived by the doctrinal ambiguities. Brilliant these will be.

Kyrie eleison.

CHARITY'S ORDER

No. CDXXV (425)

September 5, 2015

Often our world of lies says, "Black is white."
With God for measure, Catholics measure right.

What does the Catholic Church think of "racism"? Or of "anti-semitism"? Or of "sexism"? Or of "homophobia"? And so on and so on. In a liberal world where everybody is supposed to be nice to everybody, is it not surprising how "political correctness" seems to come up regularly with a new class of people for all of us to hate? The Catholic Church, following its divine Master, says we are to love our neighbour and to hate nobody, but it does not say we should love all our fellow-men indiscriminately. Let us see how a great Catholic theologian puts order into our love of God and man. Here are the bare bones of the 13 Articles of St Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, 2a 2ae, Question 26:—

1 Charity does have an order, because it is a friendship in supernatural bliss, and that bliss has its starting-point in God, and wherever you have things following from a starting-point, you have an order. (Notice how the Catholic immediately refers a major question to God. What might liberals immediately refer to as the starting-point of their "niceness"? Hatred of Nazis? Seriously . . .)

2 Charity must love God above neighbour, because charity is a friendship in bliss, and all bliss for myself or my neighbour has its source in God. (Where do liberals place the source of their happiness? In self-fulfilment? In their fellow-men? These are relatively poor forms of happiness.)

3 God must be loved above self, because all (unspoiled) creatures, each in their way, naturally love the common good above their particular good, and God is the natural and supernatural common good of all.

4 Spiritual self must be loved above spiritual neighbour, because I am closer to me than I am to my neighbour so that if I do not love me (spiritually), I am unlikely to love my neighbour. But —

5 Spiritual neighbour must be loved above corporal self, i.e., my own body, because

spirit comes before body, because spirit partakes directly in bliss, while body partakes only indirectly (through spirit).

6 Some neighbours must be loved more than others, because they all vary in their closeness to one of the two poles of charity, objective to God, or subjective to me. Saints are closer to God, neighbours to me.

7 Objectively, Saints will be loved more than relatives, but subjectively neighbours will be loved more intensely than Saints, because in a variety of ways they are closer – “Charity begins at home.”

8 Essentially, blood-relatives will be loved above non-relatives, because blood-ties are natural, fixed and substantial. Accidentally however, other ties of friendship can be more powerful.

9 Objectively, parents are to be loved more than children, because as sources of life and of many benefits, parents are closer to God, but subjectively children can be closer to us for several reasons.

10 Father should be loved more than mother, as such, because by the part each plays in giving us life, the father is formal and active whereas the mother is material (maternal) and passive (St Thomas was writing about human beings who are normal and not de-natured as they are today).

11 Objectively, parents are to be loved more than wife, because as sources of life and of many benefits they are closer to God, but subjectively she who is “one flesh” with her husband is to be loved the more.

12 Objectively, somebody doing good to us is to be loved more than somebody we do good to, because they are a source of good to us, but by subjective closeness we love the more somebody that we do good to, for various reasons, e.g. “It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

13 There will still be an order of charity in Heaven, especially the loving of God above all. Also the objective grading of neighbour for his closeness to God will count more there than it does here on earth.

“Racism”? – which races are closer to God, or to me? They are not all the same.

“Anti-semitism”? – are “Semites” friends or enemies of God? “Sexism”? – do today’s

women help or hinder me on my way to God? “Homophobia”? – how do “homos” stand with God?

Kyrie eleison.

DEFENDING VALTORTA

No. CDXXVI (426)

September 12, 2015

"The Poem of the Man-God" – tale sublime,
Truth of the Gospel, retold for our time.

Concerning the "Poem of the Man-God" by Maria Valtorta (1897–1961), a life of Our Lord extending to ten volumes written in Italian in the 1940's, an Italian priest, Don Ottavio Michelini, is alleged to have heard in the 1970's, from Our Lord himself, the following comments:—

"I have dictated to Maria Valtorta, a victim soul, a marvellous work (The Poem of the Man-God). Of this work I am the Author. You yourself, my son, have recognized Satan reacting with fury to it You have observed yourself the resistance that many priests oppose to this work. (. . .) If it were – I do not say "read" – but studied and meditated, it would do an immense good to souls. This work is a well-spring of serious and solid culture This is a work willed by Wisdom and Divine Providence for the new times. It is a spring of living and pure water. It is I, the Word living and eternal, Who have given Myself anew as nourishment to the souls that I love. I, Myself, am the Light, and the Light cannot be confused with, and still less blend Itself with, the darkness. Where I am found, the darkness is dissolved to make way for the Light."

Maria Valtorta is the 20th century equivalent of Maria of Agreda and Anne-Catherine Emmerich, of the 17th and 19th centuries respectively. The two earlier visionaries have by now gained wide respect within the Catholic Church, but Maria Valtorta is still controversial. Now one may admit that her "Poem" is not to everybody's taste. It need not be forced on anybody. It is not a substitute for the Gospel. It is not necessary for salvation. And it may seem highly dubious to support the writings of one alleged visionary with the words of another, especially when the supporting witness is as little well known as Don Michelini.

However, there are souls all over the world for whom the "Poem" has acted like a stupendous gift of God himself, for whom it has seemed to be designed to alleviate the spiritual distress of our own times, which is becoming more and more unbearable

for many. Therefore these “Comments” will dare to put before readers, once more, reasons to take seriously the testimony of Don Michelini and to interest themselves in the “Poem,” so as possibly to profit by it before God intervenes in spectacular fashion to relieve that distress. Let these reasons be the briefest of summaries of the seven reasons given supposedly by Our Lord at the end of the “Poem” for his having revealed its contents to Maria Valtorta:—

1 Doctrine – while modernism wreaks havoc with the Church’s unchanging teaching, souls need to see how I gave the selfsame teaching to the Church, from the start: divine, perfect, immutable.

2 Love – when charity is growing cold and sentimental, priests and layfolk need their love for Christ and for all that concerns Christ to be re-awakened, especially for his Mother.

3 Direction – when souls are going astray in so many different directions, spiritual directors need to see in how many different ways I looked after them.

4 Reality – when love is so widely falsified and sullied, human beings need to see Jesus and Mary as true human beings of flesh and blood, with a perfect love, but truly human, between them.

5 Suffering – when comfort everywhere comes first, pleasure-seekers need to know how long and varied were the sufferings of my Mother and myself, starting tens of years before the Passion.

6 Word – when language is utterly debased, people need to see the power of my Word, of my words, to transform souls, e.g. from rough sinners into great Apostles.

7 Judas – when evil is so sentimentalized as to be denied, sinners must be shown the mystery of iniquity in human form, so as not to follow Judas to Hell.

Kyrie eleison.

DAMNABLE NATURALISM

No. CDXXVII (427)

September 19, 2015

Nature sufficed before the Incarnation,
But now, without Our Lord, there's just damnation.

"I am a man. I stand on my own feet. I have a mind and a will and a sense of duty. I can lead a decent, even noble, life on the natural level, far above mere materialism. Now you as a Catholic come and tell me of a supernatural, superhuman life, superior to the natural life, requiring supernatural virtues to be lived. You tell me it is a life far superior to the natural life, made possible by an Incarnate God, and promising unimaginable bliss. Now that is all very well, but quite honestly, I find human nature is enough: the life of neither an angel nor a beast. I want neither the Heaven to come, nor the demands it makes here on earth. I decline the benefit with the burden. I will content myself with a decent natural life, that God will reward with a decent natural after-life."

That is how Cardinal Pie (1815–1880) put in the mouth of many an upright and respectable citizen of mid-19th century the grave error of naturalism, which was sending then, and has sent ever since, huge numbers of souls down to Hell. Naturalism is the denial, or as here, the refusal, of the whole supernatural order. Nature is all, or is all that I want. Nothing above nature exists, or if it does exist, I politely decline it. Leo XIII in his Encyclical denounced naturalism as being the essential error of Freemasonry (see *Humanum Genus*). Naturalism is the huge error of Hollywood, barely noticed because all of us have grown so used to the modern world as moulded by the Freemasons, one of whose principles is to be everywhere but to be seen nowhere. Cardinal Pie answered his respectable citizen with three arguments:—

Firstly, God is the Creator and the sovereign Lord of man, his creature. Having created the natural man who indeed belongs to the natural order (God's gift of the world to man), he retained the right to perfect man by raising him also to the supernatural order (God's gift of God to man). In fact God did appoint man to enter the supernatural order, by an act of love which man has no right to refuse, because the

gift and the love are so great. Thus God makes the benefit an obligation, under severe penalty for refusal of the benefit, and for revolt against the love. The nobility of participating in God's own nature by his gift of supernatural grace constitutes an obligation, such that he who refuses to behave like a son will be treated like a slave.

Secondly, reason itself proves that God revealed himself through his Son, Jesus Christ. If God reveals, I must see. Now his Incarnate Son revealed that to refuse to believe is to be condemned (Mk. XVI, 16). The Father has handed all judgment to the Son (Jn. V, 22–23). Every knee must bow to Jesus (Phil. II, 9–11). Every intelligence is to come under Jesus (II Cor. X, 4–6). All things are summed up in Jesus (Eph. I, 10–12; Heb. II, 8). There is no other name under Heaven than that of Jesus by which we can be saved (Acts, IV, 11–12). St Augustine on Jn. XV says, either one is attached to Christ like branch to vine and one bears fruit, or one is detached from him and is thrown into the fire. Vine or fire! You don't want the fire? Cling to the vine!

Thirdly, to lead a truly decent natural life without supernatural grace is impossible. Fallen man is weak in mind and will. In practice, the Cardinal asks, how many "decent and respectable citizens" without God's grace are capable of resisting all temptation? By day they behave decently in the office, but at night . . . ? They follow the noble Plato in public, but in private they follow the pleasure-seeking Epicurus. "Admit it, Sir," warns the Cardinal: "In men's eyes you may always have been very correct, but not in your own eyes, and if there is not a drop of Christ's Blood in your soul, you are heading for punishment."

Kyrie eleison.

EUROPE, AWAKE!

No. CDXXVIII (428)

September 26, 2015

Europe, you're being invaded with great skill.
Return to God, or be invaded still.

If any readers have not yet woken up, let them wake up. A report of a few days ago from a reader in Germany tells of news never reported in our vile media, vile precisely because they tell so many lies and so little truth (but is it not we the people who are essentially responsible for our media . . . ?).

“Germany, Austria and neighbouring lands to the south-east have been undergoing for the last few months an aggressive invasion of foreigners disguised as ‘refugees,’ a large majority of whom are young men, spoiling for a fight. Bavaria’s Minister-President Horst Seehofer, looking as pale as a sheet, said on local TV last Sunday that law and order were on the brink of collapse. Yet our puppet-governments and our mass media, at the service of the enemies of God, support this invasion by all means at their disposal, including misused State force, such as the police and the army. These puppets also lie in print, to hide the invasion from the people and thus cause as much damage as possible.

“The mass of people are still asleep, although more and more men of the land around here and elsewhere are speaking openly of civil war. In outlying regions of Bavaria things are coming to a halt. Residents and goods can no longer move, or only with long delays. About the hordes of invaders – not yet grouped together – ranging freely through the countryside and stealing, the mass-media breathe not a word. The local authorities – under orders from above – have lost all control, and the police advise the victimised population to look after themselves and eventually form civil defence groups – after we were completely disarmed a few years ago.

“Croatia has called for mobilisation of its army, which is everywhere getting on its feet. I want to see what I can do locally, but I am afraid that most of my fellow-countrymen still have no idea what is happening. If just a certain number of them wake up, they will fight like lions, which is why our so-called government, and the enemies of God who control it, are lying and deceiving at all levels to put off that

moment of awakening. It is going to be bad . . .” (End of reader’s report)

The emergency described here is not of course confined to Germany. A similar disaster is afflicting many other Western nations as well. It is unbelievable, unless one looks at it from a religious point of view, and then it all makes sense. Look up the whole of Psalm 105 (106, new numbering). God gave to the Israelites gifts and corresponding responsibilities to which they were repeatedly unfaithful. If he loved them, he could not leave them unpunished (Heb.XII, 7–8). Here are verses 35 to 41 of the Psalm, adapted to our own time:—

“And the Christians were mingled among the heathens, and learned their works, and served the same idols of liberalism, and it became a stumbling-block to them. And they sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the devils of contraception and abortion and they shed innocent blood: the blood of their sons and daughters which they sacrificed to the idols of self-centred pleasure-seeking. And the land was polluted with blood, and was defiled with their works; and they went aside after their own electronics. And the Lord was exceedingly angry with the people: and he abhorred those whom he had specially gifted. And he delivered them into the hands of their age-old enemies: and those that had hated the Christians for 2000 and 1400 years had dominion over them.”

Europe’s disaster is by God’s permission. The solution is of course to turn to God: verse 44, “And he saw when they were in tribulation, and he heard their prayer, (46) and he gave them unto mercies, in the sight of all those that had made them captives. (47) Save us, O Lord, our God, and gather us from among your enemies”

Kyrie eleison.

ARGENTINIAN CORROBORATION

No. CDXXIX (429)

October 3, 2015

By tellers of troubles we may not be charmed,
But, “A man forewarned is a man forearmed.”

A reader from South America corroborates what a reader from North America wrote here a few weeks ago. Readers, take heart – next week will see here several positive suggestions.

“How this North-American, brother in the Faith of all time, sees present and future, is excellent. I agree with him entirely. For more than 30 years a few friends and I have been warning how this situation, humanly speaking seemingly irreversible, will end. We are few for sure, because in the light of all the present madness we may be concerned for the future, we may see what is to come and is now at the door, but when we argue that people must prepare for it, how can they not be scandalized by our concerns? How can anybody not take us for jokesters, nihilists or madmen?

“Like the mass of people today, they are up to their necks in making that paycheck, in earning enough money to pay their bills, in working out whether they can afford to go back into debt. For such people it is obvious madness, a psychotic distraction, to talk to them about the possibility of a banking crisis, all the more of an apocalyptic catastrophe. They cannot accept that the wobbly house of cards which they have sacrificed so much to set up, amidst labyrinths of financial propaganda and captivating loans offered them by the bank, may all fall down. In desperate pursuit of lower lending fees or financing free of interest, they strive constantly to maintain the perverse consumerism which is their way of life, with their heads buried in the modern quagmire.

“Who but a ‘madman’ can be thinking of sources of water, canned foods and homegrown products, sources of information independent of the Internet, non-traditional sources of energy, printers running on heavy-duty rechargeable batteries, reams of A4 paper, materials for binding, basic medicines, disinfectants and anaesthetics, surgical instruments, solid fuels, especially wood, coal and liquids, etc, etc, everything necessary to face the worst of contingencies? Because I am absolutely

convinced that that is what lies ahead, because nobody gets out of a crisis like we are in without a worldwide purification such as has never been seen before.

“However, it is being spiritually prepared which is the most important, being able to leave aside our own needs in the terrible moments to come, and help those closest to us by giving a word of encouragement, a piece of bread, a little water, some explanation of why the total disaster will have struck. That way, instead of accusing God, they may, once extricated from the overwhelming distractions of the world, rediscover the true path to save their souls. A wife and mother from Syria told a Sister from this country that the war of aggression they are now undergoing in Syria has enabled them to realize that the comfort in which they were living before had made them lose sight of the simple life-style so necessary for true Christians, and that amidst such a crisis they were now happier than before, because they were now focused on essentials: the day-to-day life of the Christian, raising his eyes to God and to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

“That is why despite the evil all around, I myself see good news on all sides, inspiring in me joy and the hope of limitless heavenly possibilities, unimaginable at present, once this perverse world is defeated and wiped out. People making sacrifices to look after their neighbours, the honourable life of many soldiers, the examples of martyrs, family fathers striving to give a Christian education to their children, thousands of people thinking along the lines of the North American referred to above, Traditionalists reacting, and many other examples – it is all good news, and should refresh our souls with the cool breeze of trust in God. He never fails us. It is enough to imitate the life of his Son. But there being no Redemption without suffering, then it is absolutely certain that this infamous and perverted diabolical world of lies will not fall down by itself without an exemplary Chastisement.”

Kyrie eleison.

POSITIVE ADVICE

No. CDXXX (430)

October 10, 2015

We are not left with nothing we can do.
Where there's a will, there's a way to see this through.

Americans have an expression, "To think outside the box." It means to think outside of one's usual way of thinking. If ever there was a time for "thinking outside the box," that time is now. For six or seven hundred years mankind has been turning away from God, in a process which it has freely chosen and which God does not intervene to stop, as he could easily do, because he does not give us men our free-will to take it away again. Also, if he is now allowing this process to be reaching in our own time its logical conclusion, he must be hoping that as the crisis deepens and the pressures increase, so there will be more and more souls driven to think outside the box of their materialism, and by so doing get back on the road to Heaven.

Now how the next few years unfold remains God's secret, especially the calendar. However, it seems highly probable that the suburban and urban areas where most of us live will be seriously destabilized, firstly because these areas are largely immersed in materialism and "happily" living without God, which must call down his wrath, and secondly because these areas are as intrinsically unstable as they are cut off from nature and artificial, depending more and more on the fragile system of supermarkets for sustenance and survival, on the under-manned police forces for any peace and order, on the Internet's vulnerable satellites for their information and communications, on the villainous banks for the roof over their heads.

In fact only when the crisis really hits will we truly realise how fragile was our environment that seemed as natural as nature. Therefore for subsistence and survival it surely makes sense to lay in a stock of food and water; for information and guidance to lay in a battery-operated radio (with batteries); for law and order to lay in some physical means of self-defence, and to make contact with one's immediate neighbours, however little one may have chosen them, because friends in need will be friends indeed; and for the roof over one's head, to get as far as one can, as soon as one can, out of debt and out of the clutches of the bankers, although we are late in the day for

that.

A Catholic reader goes further by suggesting that Catholics in a given area band together to set up Catholic refuges, even material as well as spiritual, invisible as such from the outside, but where the joy of the Faith will reign on the inside. That seems a strange thought. It is certainly “outside the box.” It depends upon a number of Catholics living close to one another who share the same sense of urgency as to imminent events, but it is an idea whose time may come. Also some ‘student’ should make good use of his time at ‘university’ by doing a thesis on how Catholics kept the Faith under brutal Communist repression. Globalism is not yet physically brutal, but that can make it all the more dangerous for souls.

And finally a priest makes a few classic suggestions for spiritual means to meet the present spiritual needs, which are urgent enough, even without grave events being imminent. The full 15-Mystery Rosary every day has Heaven’s guarantee for its efficacy. A 24-hour fast on bread and water can obtain miracles. A corporal work of mercy, eg real alms to a real beggar (more difficult than writing a cheque) pulls down grace. So does a spiritual work of mercy, like giving a Catholic leaflet or a Miraculous Medal to non-Catholics. Total abstinence from the Internet for one or several days can put a brake on habits of wasting time, and it can make half an hour available to meditate instead on the Passion of Our Lord, who is only waiting and longing for us to make use of all that He suffered.

Kyrie eleison.

FATHER'S DISTRESS

No. CDXXXI (431)

October 17, 2015

A family father knows not where to turn?
Dear Dad, Our Lord will never crash or burn!

Your Excellency,

I am sorry to bother you, but I am a father responsible for getting many little souls that God has entrusted me with to Heaven and I've never been so lost or confused about how to do it as I am now. I am trying not to feel hopeless as I see both my Catholic world and the rest of the world in a tail-spin, about ready to crash and burn. A clerk in today's United States gets sent to jail if they refuse to issue a license for a same-sex marriage. What next? But I do go on hoping because God has given us many children, and another is on its way. Why is God allowing us to bring more children into this world when it seems as if it's about to end? Should my wife and I be preparing ourselves to see them martyred? I have not up till now found devotion to Our Lady too easy, but now even I find myself turning to her.

The immediate problem is what we have found to be happening with our local Traditional Catholic parish. We moved here to guarantee for the children especially, but also for ourselves, the true Mass and a Catholic formation. Alas, many things have come to light that have left us shocked, confused and feeling defeated. There seem to be demonic influences at work, and we have had to wonder if even the priests are not under their evil grip, because they are not the same priests we knew a year ago. For the past year we have done our best to help, but to no avail. We have continued to attend Mass there, all the while praying, fasting and doing Novenas in the hope that things would change. We have "watched and prayed," and like the spouse of an alcoholic we have made excuses for them for as long as we could. But finally things have occurred which are driving us to look elsewhere if we do not want our children to be confused about their faith.

So where do we go from here? Obviously I want the children to have the Sacraments and to continue to grow in the faith by attending a valid Mass, so long as it is there. To raise these children's souls for Christ my wife and I also have an essential need of

the graces of the Mass. We want to stay away from major cities. My work situation is such that I could seek work anywhere in the United States. Where do we go?

Dear Father of a large family,

First and foremost, as I read everything you write, let me advise you to count your blessings. Almighty God is not making things easy for you, but nor did he do so for his own Son on earth. This is a “valley of tears,” but amid the tears, God is giving to you and to your family many graces. You are keeping the faith, you have been given to see the need for true Tradition, and your making it your first priority to get your family to Heaven is another huge grace. The Devil may have thrown quite an obstacle in your way, but you have seen it was him. Count on it, there will be many more such obstacles before this crisis is over, and the worst of them are liable to come from the priests (“We carry our treasure in vessels of clay,” says St Paul). Never be surprised by evil today, the Devil is running wild. Therefore above all, keep well in mind how much God is doing for you, as he did for the Holy Family, despite all the apparent hardships. That will put them in the right perspective. And do not be surprised if as the man of the family, God wants you to take some manly decisions for its future. He is not going to take these decisions for you.

Alright, you say, but the question remains, where do we go? Answer, wherever you are sure of finding firstly, work for yourself and secondly, the true Mass, in that order, because the family cannot survive without a breadwinner. As for the Mass, 20 years ago one might not have hesitated to say, it must be a Society of St Pius X Mass. Today, that is no longer so sure. I would say, go rather by the priest than by his Congregation, or label. Expect failures and betrayals. We are all adrift in a sea of apostasy. But have a boundless, a boundless confidence in Our Lord and his Mother. They will never let you go unless you want to be let go. Have compassion on your fellow human beings. And God bless you.

Kyrie eleison.

BISHOPS' SYNOD

No. CDXXXII (432)

October 24, 2015

God's Law belongs to God and not to man.
Man must, with Christ, obey as best he can.

When the three-week meeting of Catholic bishops from all over the world opened in Rome on October 4 to discuss questions on the family, many Catholics feared that it would undermine the Church's unchangeable moral doctrine, especially since Pope Francis is so intent on reaching out to immoral modern man. However, traditionally minded Catholics have been encouraged by the emergence before and during the Synod of substantial resistance by many Newchurch prelates to any such undermining. Only tomorrow will the Synod's results be known, but certain things are clear, whatever those results may be.

Firstly, let nobody say that there is nothing Catholic left in the mainstream Catholic Church. Conciliarism may well have infected the faith and morals of many, even most, of its prelates, but to claim that all of them are utterly corrupt is a gross injustice and over-simplification. Obviously a number of them are doing their best to uphold God's moral law.

Secondly, however, these (in this respect) good men are fighting from a weak position because dogma is the foundation of morals, and with Vatican II the Newchurch abandoned dogma. Dogma founds morals because, for instance, if God, Heaven and Hell (dogma) do not exist, then why should I obey the Ten Commandments (morals)? And Vatican II by its Declaration on Religious Liberty wrecked dogma because if, as it taught, a State must recognize the right of all its citizens to practise in public the religion of their choice, then Jesus Christ cannot be God, because if he is, then the State, coming from God just as much as all the men composing it come from God, can grant no such right to religions denying that he is God, and for it to grant such a right is implicitly to deny that Jesus is God. Thus 50 years before the Synod, Vatican II undermined in advance all subsequent defenders of Christian morals, however decent as men they may be, unless they repudiate Vatican II.

That is why, thirdly, as John Vennari argues (one need not agree with everything he

says), the essential trick of those at the Synod seeking to change Catholic morals has been the “turn towards man” underlying all of Vatican II. Here is the trick: “God’s Church is for man. True, God cannot change, but his Law must fit man, and yesterday’s Law no longer fits today’s man. Therefore that Law must be adapted to modern times.” However the Catholic Church was purchased by the Blood of Christ not to pull God down to man, but to raise man up to God, and to provide him through Christ with the means of being thus raised.

And fourthly, as Michael Voris says (one need not agree with everything he says), the Synod has been full of “bishop babble.” This is because many Newbishops will never have been properly taught Catholic doctrine, in fact they may well have learned that there is no such thing as unchanging truth. Thanks to Vatican II their minds are adrift among the morals and anti-morals of all the religions of the world. It can be no wonder then if they are hardly capable of thinking, and if they run loose at the mouth.

And fifthly, as an honourable colleague from the Society of St Pius X says (he has been criticised before now in these “Comments”), even if the Synod were to close tomorrow with entirely Catholic conclusions, still God’s moral law will have been undermined by the mere fact of its having been questioned on major points for a length of time, officially and in public. Moreover this Synod seems sure to rest even true conclusions not on their objective truth, but on the bishops’ vote, so that the liberals can come back next year or the year after, for one vote after another, until they finally get what they want. Today the voting game belongs to them.

Kyrie eleison.

AGAIN, CULTURE

No. CDXXXIII (433)

October 31, 2015

Catholics, be willing pagans to discuss –
Augustine said, “All truth belongs to us.”

A reader of the ‘Comments’ questions again the value of non-Catholic culture when she attacks them for praising Wagner (EC 9) and T.S. Eliot (EC 406, 411). For her, T.S. Eliot is to be dismissed as a Protestant, while Wagner is a Jacobine devil in love with Buddhism, whose music is loaded with gnostic impurity. Now both Eliot and Wagner have their faults, grave faults when measured against the fullness of Catholic truth, as the ‘Comments’ mentioned above pointed out. But in our sick age they have their utility, which can be summed up in a few words, attributed to St Augustine: “All truth belongs to us Christians.”

Eliot and Wagner both belong to yesteryear’s “culture.” Culture we will define for our purposes here as the stories, music and pictures that men of all ages need, to nourish their minds and hearts. Thus defined, culture reflects and reveals, it teaches and moulds. It reflects, because it is the product of some writer, musician or artist who had the talent to give expression to what was going on in the souls of his contemporaries. If it was popular in its time, it revealed part of what was going on in their souls, and if it has become a classic since, like Eliot and Wagner, that is because it reflects and reveals part of what goes on in the souls of men of all time. Thus Eliot from the very poverty of his Unitarian upbringing was enabled to draw his daunting portrait of modern man, while Wagner by a towering talent, aside from any buddhism or gnosticism, filled his operas with a wealth of true human psychology that thousands of commentators have not ceased to interpret since.

Culture also moulds and teaches, because the writer or musician or artist gives expression and form to movements, until then formless, in the minds and hearts of his contemporaries. Shelley called poets “the unacknowledged legislators of the world.” Elvis Presley and the Beatles had a huge influence on modern youth, for generations to come. Picasso almost created modern art, and thereby fashioned to a large extent how modern people visualise the world around them. These modern examples of the

huge influence of literature, music and the arts on human beings are hardly rejoicing because modern man is so godless, and there is in him so little of value to be reflected or expressed, but the huge influence cannot be denied.

In brief, culture is based in, and issues from, men's souls. And the Catholic Church is in the business of saving men's souls. So how could it neglect culture? Its own writers have directed men's thoughts, and its artists and musicians have filled its churches with beauty to uplift men's souls to God ever since the Church began. Of course that is true for Catholic culture, somebody might object, but neither Eliot nor Wagner were Catholics. Then of what use can they be to the Church?

In man there are three things: grace, sin and nature. As coming from God, our basic nature can only be good, but as flawed by original sin it is weak and inclines to evil. Nature is like the battlefield of the war to eternity between grace and sin for the possession of that nature. Grace lifts it up and heals that nature. Sin pulls it down. Hence the never-ending war. Now Eliot and Wagner may have been lacking in grace, but they were given by God to be masters of nature. The Church is commander-in-chief on the side of saving souls. How could it fail to study the battlefield, and to draw all possible profit from the masters of nature, to know the souls of the time and to teach them?

Kyrie eleison.

VATICAN II UPROOTED

No. CDXXXIV (434)

November 7, 2015

A God diminished, emptied out, cut down,
Will not appeal. Christ must regain his crown.

I have just been re-reading Michael Davies' *Pope John's Council*, written in 1977 and hardly needing to be up-dated nearly 40 years later. If anything, Michael Davies was too kind to the Council, but there are many home truths in the book, so that it can be warmly recommended to anybody beginning to study the Council. Especially interesting is the Appendix VI consisting of a review by Professor Louis Salleron from 1936 of the French philosopher Jacques Maritain's (1882–1973) then recently appeared book, *Integral Humanism*. This book so interested an Italian priest, Giovanni-Battista Montini, that he translated it into Italian. Later he became Pope Paul VI, the main architect of Vatican II. Thus Salleron uncovers the roots of the Council, 26 years before it began.

Integral Humanism presents Maritain's vision of a new future for a remodelled Christendom. Bourgeois civilisation is doomed, but instead of the Church continually condemning the man-centred humanism which gave rise to the French Revolution (1789) which gave rise to that bourgeoisie, the Revolution needs to be recognised as part of an on-going and inevitable historical process with which Christianity can and must come to terms. By this means, while the whole course of modern history cannot be stopped, nevertheless by Christ the humanism can be made truly, fully human, becoming "integral humanism." Christianity thus rebuilt on modern foundations will bring Christ to modern man and modern man to Christ, the admirable intention of Maritain and Paul VI and Bishop Fellay.

But "the way to Hell is paved with good intentions," says the wise old proverb. Salleron admires all kinds of things in the book of Maritain, who was a philosopher skilled in Thomism and knew well, says Salleron, how to present any idea in such a way as not to contradict Catholic doctrine. But Salleron objects strongly to Maritain's reading of modern history and calls it "Marxist." Karl Marx (1818–1883) also started out from the rot of bourgeois civilisation but concluded that it must be completely

torn down by on-going Revolution to make way for the dream of the classless society, which worked out in reality as the nightmare of Communism. So Maritain rejected Marx' conclusion but accepted his analysis of history, so as to fashion a new compromise Christianity that would work for modern man: neither modernity on modern foundations (Marx – and Wagner), nor Christ on Christ's foundations (Pius X – see especially his Letter on the Sillon – and Archbishop Lefebvre), but Christ on modern foundations. The result is that Newchristianity which is to be found throughout the documents of Vatican II, namely Christ is the true fulfilment of man – not man is ordered to Christ and to God, but God and Christ are ordered to man.

Alas, compromise solutions do not work with Our Lord. He says, "Let your speech be yes, yes or no, no: and that which is over and above these, is of evil" (Mt. V, 37). And "He that is not with me, is against me" (Mt. XII, 30). A man-centred religion of the true God is a contradiction in terms. Salleron points out that there is nothing inevitable in the march of modern history such as Marx and Maritain imagined. If modern man is going to the Devil, it is by man's own free choice. What liberals like Maritain and Paul VI and Bishop Fellay do not grasp is the reality of evil. They do not grasp that modern man simply does not want Christ, and God will not force man to do so. Liberals will diminish God so as to make him appealing to modern man, but most modern men will turn away, in indifference or disgust. Vatican II has been a colossal failure, and "integral humanism" has been just one more example of disintegrating humanism, because it is not centred on God.

Politics, economics, the banks, finance, the arts, medicine, law, agriculture, the whole of modern society must come back under the Social Kingship of Christ the King. That was Archbishop Lefebvre's solution. It is the only solution.

Kyrie eleison.

DOGGED INFIDELS

No. CDXXXV (435)

November 14, 2015

When Europe had the faith, it could defeat
The Muslim hordes, but now? – one long retreat.

As the faltering remains of Christendom face today a Muslim invasion organized by the millennial enemies of God, and made possible by the Western nations' wretched politicians and vile media, it is well to remember how often in times past Christendom was threatened by Muslim invasions, and how Christendom then defended itself, by turning to God. In the summer of 1683, a huge Muslim army of anything from 150 to 300 thousand soldiers besieged Vienna and threatened to engulf Europe from the south-east. The Muslims even envisaged capturing Rome, for the glory of Islam.

With the help of a saintly Capucin, Fr. Marco da Aviano, Pope Innocent XI succeeded in putting together a Christian army from several European nations to relieve Vienna. Here is the prayer of the Capucin just before the battle:—

“O Lord God of Hosts, Behold us prostrate at the feet of your Majesty, to obtain forgiveness for our sins. Well do we know how we have deserved that the infidels take up arms to oppress us, because the iniquities committed by us every day against your goodness have justly provoked your wrath. O great God, from the depth of our hearts we ask you to forgive us; we execrate sin because you abhor it; it pains us that we have often angered your supreme goodness. For love of you we would rather die a thousand times than commit the least act to displease you. Come to our aid, O Lord, with your grace, and let not your servants break the pact which we have made with you alone. Have pity upon us, have pity on your Church, which the fury and strength of the infidels are even now preparing to oppress. Even if it is by our own fault that they have broken in on the serenity of these Christian countries, and even if all the ills coming upon us are none other than the consequence of our own wickedness, still be propitious towards us, O God of all goodness, and despise not the work of your own hands. Remember how, to save us from the slavery of Satan, you shed all of your Precious Blood.

“Will you allow it to be trodden underfoot by these dogs? Can it be that you will

permit the precious pearl of the faith, which you sought out with such zeal and rescued with so much suffering, to be thrown to these swine to be trampled on? Forget not, O Lord, that if you allow the infidels to prevail over us, they will blaspheme your holy Name and mock your power, crying out a thousand times, “Where is their God, the God who was powerless to save them from our hands?” Let it not be held against you, O Lord, that you gave way to the fury of the wolves, just when we were calling upon you in our misery and anguish. Great God of battles, come to our aid! If you favour our cause, the armies of the infidels cannot harm us. Scatter these people that have wanted war! For our part, we ask no more than to be at peace with you, with ourselves and with our neighbour . . .”

The prayer continues with the request for the Christian army’s leaders and soldiers to be strengthened with God’s grace, with the spirit and courage of the heroes of the Old Testament, so that they may reduce to nought the enemies of the Christian name, and show forth God’s power. Let God look down on the Christian soldiers’ faith, hope and charity. On His behalf Marco will bless them on their way to battle. Let God hold back the arm of his wrath raised over them, and let His enemies know that there is no other God beside Him. Like Moses, Marco will lift his arms to bless the Christian soldiers. May God grant them victory, and the ruin of His and their enemies, Amen.

How politically incorrect! “Dogs” and “swine” – How racist! Intolerable! But the fact is that God granted to the Christians a sensational victory which threw back the Muslims for 300 years. Now they are back. And this time there is virtually no repentance left to call upon Almighty God . . .

Kyrie eleison.

NOVUS ORDO MISSAE – I

No. CDXXXVI (436)

November 21, 2015

God has worked miracles with the N.O. Mass?
That's what the evidence suggests. Alas?

"Facts are stubborn things," is a famous quote of the United States' second President, John Adams (1735–1826), "and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations or the dictates of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence." Concerning the New Order of Mass imposed upon the entire Latin Rite Church by Paul VI in 1969, there are some stubborn facts, apt to perturb the "wishes and inclinations" of Catholics cleaving to Catholic Tradition. Let successive issues of these "Comments" first of all present some of these facts; secondly let us see how they may be explained in view of the disastrous role played over the last 46 years by the NOM in helping Catholics to lose the Faith, and thirdly let us deliberate as to what conclusions a wise Catholic needs to draw. First of all, some facts:—

On august 18, 1996, in St Mary's parish church in the centre of Buenos Aires, Argentina, Fr Alejandro Pezet was finishing distributing communion (of a new Mass, for sure) when a woman told him of a discarded host at the back of the church. A parishioner having received communion in the hand must have dropped it on their way out of church and abandoned it as being too dirty to be consumed off the floor. Fr Pezet picked it up, put it correctly in a vase of water and placed it in the tabernacle where in a few days it would normally dissolve and could be properly disposed of. However, when on August 26 he opened the tabernacle, what was his surprise to find that the host had turned into a bloody substance. Photographs taken on Bishop Bergoglio's orders 11 days later showed that it had significantly increased in size. For three years it was kept under strict secret in the tabernacle, but in 1999 then Archbishop Bergoglio decided to carry out a scientific analysis. On October 15, 1999, in the presence of witnesses he allowed Dr Ricardo Castañon, a neuro-psycho physiologist approved of by Rome, to take a sample for testing.

Dr Castañon took the sample firstly to a forensic laboratory in San Francisco which recognized human ADN. A Dr Robert Lawrence located white globules. A Dr.

Ardonidoli in Italy thought it was probably heart tissue. An Australian Professor, John Walker, recognized muscular tissue with white globules intact.

To remove all doubt Dr Castañon resorted to a renowned cardiologist and forensic pathologist from Columbia University, New York, Dr Federico Zugibe, without telling him where the specimen came from.

Looking down his microscope Dr Zugibe is quoted as having said, "I can tell you exactly what it is. It is part of the muscle found in the wall of the heart's left ventricle which makes the heart beat and gives the body its life. Intermingled in the tissue are white blood-cells, which tells me firstly that the heart was alive at the moment when the sample was taken because white blood-cells die outside of a living organism, and secondly that white cells go to the aid of an injury, so this heart has suffered. This is the sort of thing I see in patients who have been beaten about the chest." When asked how long these cells would have remained alive had they come from a sample kept in water, Dr Zugibe replied that they would have ceased to exist in a matter of minutes.

When in June of 1976 Archbishop Lefebvre was on the brink of ordaining the first large batch of SSPX priests despite Rome's disapproval, a Roman official came to promise him the end of all problems with Rome if only he would celebrate one NOM. On principle, for doctrinal reasons, he refused. Then how can Almighty God have worked eucharistic miracles with and for this new Mass? Read here next week a suggested answer.

Kyrie eleison.

NOVUS ORDO MISSAE – II

No. CDXXXVII (437)

November 28, 2015

The eucharistic miracles are where
God shows that He Himself is truly there.

Facts are stubborn — as long as they are facts. If readers doubt that the eucharistic miracle of 1996 in Buenos Aires is a fact, let them undertake their own research: <http://youtu.be/3gPAbD43fTI>. But if their research of that case leaves them unconvinced, then let them look up the parallel case of Sokółka in Poland, where a whole centre of pilgrimage has arisen around a eucharistic miracle of 2008 (e.g. jloughnan.tripod.com/sokolka.htm). And a little more Internet research would surely discover accounts of more such Novus Ordo miracles, with at least some of them being authentic.

But how is that possible? Traditional Catholics absorb with their mother's milk that the new rite of Mass (NOM) is an abomination in the eyes of God, and has helped to make countless Catholics lose the Faith. This is because the NOM, like Vatican II which it followed, is ambiguous, favours heresy and has led numberless souls out of the Church, whom regular attendance at the Protestantised rite has turned into virtual Protestants. Most Traditional Catholics should be familiar with the serious doctrinal problems of this new rite, designed to diminish the essential Catholic doctrines of the Real Presence, the propitiatory Sacrifice and the sacrificing priesthood, amongst others. Then how can God work with it eucharistic miracles such as have made of Sokółka a national centre of pilgrimage for all Poland?

Doctrinally, the NOM is ambiguous, poised between the religion of God and the Conciliar religion of man. Now in matters of faith, ambiguity is deadly, being normally designed to undermine the Faith, as the NOM frequently does. But as ambiguity is precisely open to two interpretations, so the NOM does not absolutely exclude the old religion. Thus by a devout priest its ambiguities can all be turned in the old direction. That does not make the NOM acceptable as such, because its intrinsic ambiguity still favours the new direction, but it does mean for instance that the Consecration can still be valid, as Archbishop Lefebvre never denied. Moreover, if the eucharistic miracles are genuine, clearly not all Consecrations of Novus Ordo

bishops or Ordinations of Novus Ordo priests are invalid either. In brief, the NOM as such is bad as a whole, bad in parts, but not bad in all its parts.

Now let us imagine, with the utmost respect, how Almighty God stands towards the new rite of Mass. On the one hand God loves his Church like the apple of His eye, and will preserve it to the end of the world (Mt. XVI, 18). On the other hand He has chosen to entrust its government to human and fallible churchmen, whom He will guide, but to whose free-will He evidently grants a remarkable degree of free play to govern it well or badly, starting with the betrayal of His own Son. Now in modern times the Revolution, be it Jewish, Masonic, communist or globalist, finds its main adversary in His Church, and it has worked especially on the Church's leaders to make the Church collapse. Their most terrible success was Vatican II and its NOM, which were surely much more the fault of the shepherds than of the sheep. "The fort is betrayed even of them that should have defended it," said St John Fisher at a parallel moment in the Reformation. Then how will God look after His sheep, many of whom – not all – are relatively innocent of the Conciliar betrayal?

After Vatican II, some priests and laity had the grace to see immediately what a betrayal it was, and within a few years the Traditional movement was under way. To other sheep God gave the grace to see it later. But can we not all admit that there are many good Catholics who trusted their bishops, as good Catholics normally should do? And did not these bishops insist on the lie that the NOM was no different from the true Mass? What specified Vatican II and the NOM was precisely the officialisation of the modernist heresy within the Church. So does it not make sense that in punishment of their modern worldliness these sheep would broadly lose the true rite of Mass, while in reward of their desire for Mass they would not lose every valid Mass? But the Church's future depends on the souls that understand the Revolution and utterly repudiate all ambiguities of Vatican II and the NOM.

Kyrie eleison.

NOVUS ORDO MISSAE – III

No. CDXXXVIII (438)

December 5, 2015

Catholics, be generous! Recognize God's goal
To save, outside "Tradition," many a soul.

If the evidence for eucharistic miracles taking place within the Novus Ordo Church (see EC 436 and 437) is as serious as it seems, then Catholics must conform their minds to the mind of God, and not the other way round. And Catholics cleaving to Tradition have a special need to work out what God meant by the miracles, because they will not easily understand what he can have meant, when they know how distasteful to him the Novus Ordo Mass (NOM) must be in itself.

For many centuries God has been working such miracles. The primary reason has always been to strengthen the faith of Catholics in a truth of the Faith not easy to believe, but very close to the Heart of God. That after the Consecration at Mass of the bread and wine God himself takes the place of their substance is an occurrence so outside the normal course of nature that this invention of the love of God wishing to give himself as food and drink to his sheep may be practical, but it seems also incredible. So in due time and place God has wrought visible miracles in some shape or form to help doubting souls to believe. A secondary reason for these miracles, especially where there has been some profanation or other of the Holy Eucharist, is to remind Catholics of the sacred treatment and adoration always due to the humble appearances behind which hides God himself.

Both of these reasons apply today when the NOM has severely diminished the sense of the Real Presence without always nullifying it (see EC 437). Who can deny that the rite of the NOM and its practice throughout the Novus Ordo Church, e.g. Communion standing and in the hand, have set countless Catholics on their way to disbelieving in the Real Presence, and countless priests on their way to a lack of due respect in their handling of the Holy Eucharist? Who can deny that both disbelief and disrespect towards it have hugely increased since the NOM was introduced in 1969? Humanly speaking, the wonder may be not that there have been miracles at all within the framework of the NOM, but that there have not been many more. In any case,

God knows best.

However, these miracles – always assuming they are authentic – have lessons also for the Catholics of Tradition who have to some extent or another stood back from the Novus Ordo framework. The lesson most obvious is that not all Novus Ordo Masses are invalid, nor all Novus Ordo episcopal Consecrations nor all priestly Ordinations, as “Traditionalists” can be tempted to think. This is surely because while since the 1960’s a mass of Catholic sheep have become too worldly to deserve to keep the true rite of Mass, they have loved the Mass enough not to lose it altogether. The NOM may have been allowed by God to make it easier for Catholics to leave the Faith if they wanted to, but not impossible to keep it if they wanted to.

Therefore the NOM and the Novus Ordo Church as a whole are dangerous for the Faith, and Catholics are right who have clung to Tradition to avoid the danger. But as they have had to put a distance between themselves and the mainstream Church, so they have exposed themselves to the opposite danger of an isolation leading to a sectarian and even pharisaical spirit, disconnected from reality. There are true sacraments in the Novus Ordo and true Catholics, for whom God cares, and “Traditionalists” should be happy that there are. Let Traditionalists’ relative isolation not make them feel that they are bound to deny that there is anything Catholic at all left in the Novus Ordo. That is unreal, and reality’s pendulum will swing back, as with the leadership of the SSPX, presently failing to see the on-going need for isolation from the mainstream Church. No. Tradition still needs isolation, but with a generous and not an isolationist spirit.

Kyrie eleison.

BEETHOVEN BLAST

No. CDXXXIX (439)

December 12, 2015

Beethoven towers o'er music of today.
Sonatas of his hear a young man play.

In two months' time, from 18h00 on Friday evening of Feb. 19 to Sunday mid-day of Feb. 21, there will be held here in Broadstairs a three-day blast of the music of Beethoven. A young American pianist who can read at sight any of his 32 piano sonatas, and loves them all, is crossing the Atlantic to play some of them for us, we do not yet know which.

No doubt he will play the three great favourites, the Pathétique, Moonlight and Appassionata, also the Waldstein, but there will be time for him to analyze and present many others. Right now there will be no fixed programme for the three days. There will be room for plenty of questions and discussion and improvisation. A certain bishop will also be contributing to the analysis in some depth of his favourite composer. The purpose of the weekend will be for participants to take away with them an understanding they may not have had before, of how classical music ticks and of what makes Beethoven in particular one of its most famous composers.

But, somebody will object, what has music, especially Revolutionary music, to do with the defence and propagation of the Catholic Faith? The answer here has to be brief. Firstly, let nobody despise music. Both the Catholic Church and the Devil are acutely aware that it is a language uniquely capable of expressing and of shaping what goes on in the human soul, and therefore of influencing the direction which a soul is taking, towards Heaven (by Gregorian chant, for instance) or towards Hell (were not the victims of the recent shooting in Paris just then partaking in a Rock song that called on the Devil?). Almost every human being has some music or other in his soul, and that music normally runs deep, for good or ill. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that if a man does not have in him the music of his religion, he will have in him the religion of his music, e.g. the Devil. Catholics who realize that the music they love flies not much higher than Pop or Rock, may well seize the opportunity to get a handle on classical music, via a studious blast of Beethoven.

Now it is true that there is a great deal of music higher than Beethoven. He was born under the Old Order, 19 years before the French Revolution broke out in 1789, but he died 38 years later when the modern Revolutionary age was well under way, in 1827, so that his life straddled that tremendous upheaval which he expressed musically in a number of his masterworks, notably in the Appassionata piano sonata and in his Eroica Symphony, originally dedicated to that hero of the Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte. However, while the relative serenity of the musical masterworks prior to the Revolution is free of its agitation and Romantic disturbance, at the same time it is that much further removed from our own world of today, marinated in the Revolution. Therefore Beethoven can speak to souls of today that find little or no interest in music of the earlier masters. Nor is Beethoven only Revolutionary. The unique power of his best loved masterpieces derives from their Romantic wine being contained and ordered within the classical skins which he inherited from Haydn and Mozart.

To give us an idea of numbers, please let us know if you plan to attend the Beethoven weekend. Off season, local boarding-houses should have plenty of room to overnight. And if male readers would prefer something more directly Catholic, let them sign up as soon as possible for the Ignatian Exercises to be given here by Fr Abraham and myself between 18h00, December 26 and 18h00, December 31.

Kyrie eleison.

COMING MESSIAH

No. CDXL (440)

December 19, 2015

The Saviour of the World lies on cold straw –
Great God, grant us to hurt Him never more!

What a contrast there is between today's Christmas scene in the once Christian nations, and the prophecies of the Messiah to come, which are scattered throughout the Old Testament! It is the contrast between the beginning and the end of those nations. It was the coming of Christ, prepared by the Jews over two thousand years, which through his Church forged those nations (Gentiles) to take up the service of God when the Jews mysteriously chose to abandon it. Today is the end of the time of those nations because they are now abandoning God in their turn. Let us remind ourselves of the glory and infinite greatness of the Messiah's mission, and of the seriousness of turning our backs on him, by a random selection from the hundreds of messianic quotes in the Old Testament:—

1. David (1000 B.C.) – the messiah would be disowned by the Jews (Ps. XXI, 7–8). He would convert the Gentiles (Ps. XXI, 28). He would be betrayed by a disciple (Ps. XL, 10). He would be mocked in His agony (Ps. XXI, 7–9). His enemies would pierce His hands and His feet, and cast lots for his garments (Ps. XXI, 17, 19). They would give Him vinegar to drink (Ps. LXVIII, 22).

2. Isaias (720 B.C.) – The Messiah would convert the nations (II, 2–3). He would be born of a virgin (VII, 14). He would be adored as a child by kings (IX, 6–7). He would have a precursor; the precursor would prepare the people for Him (XL, 3–4). He would be mildness itself (XLII, 1–3). He would be a man of sorrows (LIII, 3). He would give His life to expiate for our sins (LIII, 5). He would never complain (LIII, 7). He would be made to seem a criminal (LIII, 12). He would reign over the world (LV, 5). His Church, His spouse, would give Him a multitude of children (LXVI, 18–23).

3. Osee (600 B.C.) – The Messiah would return from Egypt by order of His Father (XI, 1). He would convert the nations (II, 19–24). The Jews would be scattered throughout the world for denying Him (IX, 17).

4. Micheas (600 B.C.) – The Messiah would be born in Bethlehem and he would be both God and Man (V, 2). He would convert the nations (IV, 2–3). He would be our reconciliation (VII, 18–20).

5. Joel (600 B.C.) – The Messiah would send the Holy Ghost upon His Church and the faithful would prophesy (II, 28–29). The Messiah would come to judge the world in Power (III, 2).

6. Jeremias (600 B.C.) – The Messiah's birth would be known by the slaughter of innocent children for whom their mothers would weep (XXXI, 18). He would convert the nations and establish a new covenant with the people, more perfect than the first (XXXI, 31–34).

7. Ezechiel (580 B.C.) – The Messiah would be of the race of David (XVII, 22). He would receive the crown of the royal house of David (XXI, 27).

8. Daniel (500 B.C.) – The Messiah would come in 490 years from the decree to rebuild Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity; He would re-establish the reign of virtue; He would be denied by the Jews and put to death; the temple and the city of Jerusalem would be destroyed; the Jews would be in a state of desolation until the end of time (IX, 24–27).

To read these quotes again is to be reminded how inseparable the Messiah was from his people, the Jews, and yet how they have separated themselves from him ever since. By him God raised a new people, chosen by faith instead of race, and now that people also is wallowing in materialism. Lord, grant us at this time of year to remember how he changed the world, and how, without him, it is changing catastrophically back.

Kyrie eleison.

FAMILY COMPARISON

No. CDXLI (441)

December 26, 2015

Two families can both have one man for head –
So can two churches by one Pope be led.

Whereas arguments at best prove, comparisons at best illustrate. So comparisons do not prove but they can throw a lot of light from what one does know onto what one does not know. Now concerning the present crisis of the Church, half a century old, we need all the light we can get, because with each day that passes it becomes less and not more understandable. So here is a fruitful comparison sent to me recently by a recent convert to Tradition. He compares the Catholic Church and the Conciliar Church, or the Newchurch, to the legitimate and illegitimate families of one and the same man. Let us apply the comparison to his marriage, to his authority and to his children.

By a lawful marriage to his true wife a man starts a family and has legitimate children. But after a while he is unfaithful to her and divorces her to live with his mistress, by adultery with whom he also has children, who are bastards. Similarly by a Cardinal's lawful canonical election as Pope, the Cardinal becomes the legitimate father of the Catholic Church and the spiritual father by the true Faith of a multitude of true Catholics. But after a while as a Conciliar Pope he goes whoring after the modern world, and by adultery with it he engenders a new family of Conciliar bastards. Thus as one man can be the father of both a lawful and an unlawful family, so one Pope can at the same time be head of the Catholic Church and of the Newchurch.

Secondly, as the family father has true authority over his true family but no true authority over his second family because it is not his true family, so the Conciliar Pope has true authority over all true Catholics but no true authority over the Newchurch with its Conciliar Catholics. And as the first family needs its true father, and both wife and children do all they can to bring him home, but he clings to his partner in adultery and to his illegitimate children who also do all they can to hold onto him, so each Conciliar Pope is still respected by Traditional Catholics who call upon him to do his duty by them, but he prefers Conciliar Catholics who have little real respect for

him but who also hold onto him to cover their unlawful status.

And thirdly, as no true wife will accept to be put on the same footing as the adulterous partner that has supplanted her, nor will the true children (if they are mature enough) accept to be adopted by the false family and thus likened to the bastards, so Tradition is absolutely incompatible with the Newchurch, nor can true Catholics accept to be incorporated into it by any kind of sell-out or betrayal of Tradition. It is not for them to go whoring after their true father in his adulterous environment, even if he is their true father and they truly need him. It is for the father to return to his true family. Nor can the lawful children reasonably expect to bring their father home by joining him in his seductive surroundings. The much greater likelihood is that they too will be seduced.

This comparison of any Newpope to a father of two families is fruitful on many more points because it is in the nature of a Pope to be a father. But « Every comparison limps » (another brilliant comparison), and the bad leg of this comparison consists mainly in the fact that whereas the distinction between the two families of the one father is perfectly clear in real life, on the contrary the distinction between the Catholic Church and the Newchurch, while perfectly clear in theory, is very difficult to disentangle in practice, because they are almost hopelessly intertwined in real life.

To keep a Catholic head on one's shoulders it is as necessary to know the clear distinction in theory as it is to recognize the desperate confusion in practice.

Kyrie eleison.